DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 088 EA 007 460

TITLE Politics and Education: A Series of 12 Essays.
INSTITUTION American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 52p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of School Administrators, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($2.00, Quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; Educational Accountability; *Educational Administration; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal State Relationship; Interagency Cooperation; Policy Formation; Political Influences; *Political Issues; *Politics; School Integration; State Legislation; *State School District Relationship; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This is a collection of essays that originally appeared in the 1970-71 issues of "The School Administrator." All are concerned with the general topic of politics and education, and each was prepared by a recognized scholar. Each essay focuses on a set of critical questions and issues around which national policy evolves. The series is intended to provide a thoughtful basis for study and understanding of the problems and issues inherent in the changing relationships among levels of government. The essays include those originally published under the following titles: "The Politics of Education," "National Political Parties and Educational Policy Making," "Interest Groups and Federal Education Policy," "Relationships Between Federal and State Systems," "The States and Urban School Systems," "Community Influence Systems and Local Educational Policy-Making," "Political Confrontation," "Planning and Politics," "Community Involvement in Educational Policy-Making," "The Politics of School Desegregation," and "Local Interagency Cooperation." (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111088

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASA

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Politics & Education

A series of 12 essays focusing on questions and issues around which policy evolves

Published by the
American Association of School Administrators
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

EA 007 460

American Association of School Administrators

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Single copy, $2.00. Quantity orders: 2-9 copies, 10 percent discount; 10 or more copies, 20 percent discount.

Postage charged on billed orders.

3

The past few years have been exciting ones—perhaps the most eventful in the entire history of American education. Schools have been swept into a whirling vortex of cultural change that has made them a more vital part of the culture and more visible on the local, state, and national scenes than ever before.

As education has become more clearly identified with the nation's well-being, the schools have become more visible in the political arena. Perhaps at no other time in our history has education occupied such a prominent place on the agenda of the United States Congress. The growing awareness of the federal government's responsibility for education reflects a new and evolving national posture. This deeper involvement in community, state, and national life has brought to the schools new challenges, but it has brought, too, perplexing problems and issues that must be viewed and treated with new perspective.

Increasing amounts of federal funds are producing profound changes in the historical roles of the local, state, and national governments, and each level of government is attempting to find its unique role in improving American public education. The partnership that has served America so well must now be re-examined in the light of changing conditions.

Sensitive to the growing importance of education, as well as to the persistent and emerging problems and pressures impinging on school administrators, the Executive Committee of the American Association of School Administrators authorized the preparation of 12 essays, one to appear in each issue of THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR for the year 1970-71. All are concerned with the general topic, "Politics and Education." Each essay focuses on a set of critical questions and issues around which national policy evolves. The series is intended to provide a thoughtful basis for study and understanding of the problems and issues inherent in the changing relationships among levels of government.

Each essay has been prepared by a recognized scholar. The AASA expresses to each author its deep gratitude for the time and energy expended. The 12 essays should provoke thoughtful study and hopefully constructive action.

We urge each member of AASA to study the essays carefully, to discuss them with his colleagues, his board of education, his congressional representatives, and interested citizens to the end that American public education will become an even more effective institution through which the American people seek to reach their destiny.

PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Secretary
American Association
of School Administrators

Number One

"There is a myth in America that education and politics exist separate from each other. If the world of politics means something more than the choice between political parties, and if public education includes policy making and administration, then the myth hardly describes reality in American local school districts. It describes reality at the state and federal levels even less adequately. The myth is a political one which functions as an element in the politics of education, especially as a tool useful to educationists. This may be one reason it has persisted so long. . . . Despite this and the American habit of restricting the word 'politics' to its two party connotations, the politics of local school district elections [and of federal and state education acts and laws] lies at the heart of policy making in public education. . . . " [1]

So Laurence Iannaccone and I began our recent book, and I find it also an appropriate way to begin this lead article in the American Association of School Administrators' series on Politics and Education.

Not only has the myth benefited educators, but it has also worked to the advantage of local and state professional politicians. On the one hand, those in educational administration, particularly school superintendents, have benefited from the special knowledge of how these politics work and have been exceptionally skillful in playing this particular political game. At the same time, they have been able to avoid the more hazardous encounters of partisan party politics.

As an example of the hidden politics played by school superintendents is their role in the selection of school board members. In professional literature the situation is illustrated by the Jefferson School District story in *Organizing Schools for Effective Education* [2] and in *Politics, Power and Policy*.[3] It must be remembered that Jefferson is a fictionalized case, not a fictitious case.

Jefferson School District really existed, and Superintendent Donnelly lived and actually influenced a Committee for the Selection of School Board Nominees in a school district in the United States. This political influence was powerful in the governance of the school district. "For more than twenty years the committee succeeded in winning the elections for its nominees, selected with the criteria and friendly help of Dr. Donnelly." [4] Never would Dr. Donnelly have recommended that school board members be elected on a party basis. He would have fought to the death to "keep politics out of education" and probably believed that his "activities" in school board member selection were geared to do this. But his "activities" were surely political, hidden, sacred, and elite, excluding those individuals who were not "fit" for board membership—usually including professional politicians.

On the other hand, the professional politicians have been able to use education to further their political careers (e.g., the announcement of education grants, senatorial scholarships, and their support for education bills even when full appropriation is not provided) and still avoid political responsibility for the success or failure of public education. As Masters has pointed out, educational issues do not ". . . contain much political currency." [5] Such actions and beliefs on the parts of politicians and professional educators alike avoid accountability for education, allowing school officials to point the finger of guilt for poor education at the lack of support provided by the appropriate political bodies and permitting politicians to claim that education is nonpolitical and, therefore, not within

---

This article, "The Politics of Education," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by Frank W. Lutz, director, Division of Education Policy Studies, Pennsylvania State University. It is the first in a series of twelve essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."

their province. Thus Richard Nixon pointed to the powerful "education lobby" and the inflationary trend as he vetoed the billion dollar education bill, but did not mention the military-industrial lobby or inflation as he signed the $80 billion-plus Defense Department measure. Perhaps this anomaly can be explained by the nature of educational politics that refuses to play the political game forthrightly, clothed in the sacred garb of the educational priesthood, clinging to and perpetuating the notion that the education of children is too important to be left to the whims of politics.

Local School Politics

In the past several years there has been a renewed interest in the governance of local education. Perhaps the best research example of this trend is the project sponsored by the Danforth Foundation that examined the decision-making processes of five urban school boards: Boston, Chicago, Columbus, New York, and Los Angeles. Three years in progress, this major study will be reported in book form and at major conventions during 1970-71. Operationally, the upsurge of local school politics is demonstrated by demands for "community control" in large urban districts, discussions of federated educational units to alleviate the flight from the cities, and the alarming increase in defeats of budget, tax, and bond referendums needed to support local education. The defeat of school levies has become so prevalent across the nation that a major network devoted an hour of prime time to the program, "The Day the Schools Had To Close," describing a small Ohio town whose school district could not muster approval of a budget. Not only small towns but also major cities such as Philadelphia are threatening to close because of financial crises. The New York City schools are plagued with many problems. In 1968-69, for example, Mayor Lindsay cut one million dollars from the school budget without so much as an explanation.[6] Whether or not the school district is dependent or independent from the city government for its fiscal resources, tax dollars are obtained by political means. In dependent districts the referendum is a political act, and the attempt to influence an outcome favorable to the school district is political, although often feeble. In Oregon, 45 districts had held budget elections as of May 1. In 14 districts the budgets were not approved. This 31 percent represented a new high in what a Portland paper called ". . . the rebellion against property taxes."[7] In Oregon, as across the nation, the trend toward budget and bond defeats is increasing. In 1966 only 16 districts had to resubmit their budgets. In 1967 and 1968, there were 67 resubmissions. In 1969 it took 501 elections to pass the 337 district budgets; some districts had to vote as many as four times. No one cares to predict the fate of the budgets in the months ahead. The behavior of the voter in school tax elections is one of the most interesting and critical problems in education today.

One should not be deluded into thinking that fiscal independence is likely to provide a haven from the political requirements of acquiring a sufficient share of the tax dollar to provide quality public education. The action is again hidden from the public eye and while some schoolmen are adept at this game, more often they are out-maneuvered by the professional politician and other special interest groups. Previously cited examples at both federal and local levels attest to this statement. There is mounting evidence that large teacher organizations that are allied with organized labor and willing to utilize the strike to obtain their economic goals have considerably more political clout at both local and state levels than the politically sacred school board.

If local control of education is to survive, we must find more effective ways of mobilizing the electorate in local tax and bond referendums. In addition, we must discover ways of providing a broader local tax base such as a federated school system would provide, while at the same time making community participation in educational governance more practical and public education more accountable to the clients it serves. The community control plans that have been proposed in a number of cities might do just this. These suggestions are not offered as panaceas for the problems of modern public education, but the issues that elicited them furnish the reasons why the politics of education is becoming an important area of study and practice. While many books on community politics since the 1930's considered education as an issue,[8] it was not until the middle 1960's that books were devoted to educational politics[9] and not until 1970 that a book was exclusively devoted to the politics of a local school district.[10]

State Politics of Education

Perhaps because education is a function of the separate states, there has been a greater interest in the state politics of education than in the local politics of education. Excellent examples of examinations of the state politics of education can be found in the work of Stephen Bailey *et al.*;[11] Nicholas Masters *et al.*;[12] Laurence Iannaccone;[13] and Michael Usdan *et al.*,[14] all completed during the last decade. In general these works have pointed to the relationships between state professional education pyramids and the state legislature, usually rurally dominated and never clearly urban-oriented. The predominant focus of these books is the problems and processes of state financing of education.

During his lifetime Professor Paul Mort of Teachers College, Columbia University, exemplified the important "scribblers" role in state education. In this role prominent educators develop educational legislation for the state. Other prominent state legislation categories during the past

6

30 years include school district reorganization and professional certification.

Given the interface between the local and state issues and between elementary-secondary and higher education, Usdan states: "In summary, the relationship between elementary-secondary and higher education is such that it demands a united, well coordinated interlevel [political] effort to minimize its own internal conflict and at the same time to insure its rightful share of scarce state resources. This study has not shown that educational leaders are yet capable of offering such leadership. It is clear, however, that such has to be the direction of the future." [15]

More recently, financing and local control, and educational employee concerns have become intertwined in New York,[16] creating new political conflicts such as the decentralization issue and statewide public employee legislation.

Educational Politics at the Federal Level

From the time the members of the constitutional convention debated the place of education in the federal constitution and decided to leave it lumped with other issues in the general welfare clause, and, therefore, the general responsibility of the states, education has been an issue of federal policy and politics. This statement may at first appear inconsistent. Upon further examination, it becomes very meaningful. Educators have long held that public education is a local matter, not to be interfered with either by state government or by the federal government. Yet from the outset the federal government has been concerned with public education. Only after considerable debate did the founding fathers leave education solely within the general welfare clause, thus creating it as a state responsibility but not a local responsibility. Each state shoulders this responsibility in its state constitution. But the federal government has never left it at that. While the specter of federal control is invariably raised with each new act, the federal government has long been active in education. The Northwest Ordinance of 1785, the Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1912, the GI Bill of World War II, and subsequent Korean and Vietnamese bills are but examples of federal-level legislation that has dealt specifically with education. More recently, the Congress has become increasingly concerned with education as demonstrated by NDEA, ESEA, and EDPA and the expanding role of the U.S. Office of Education in program development and policy determination at local levels. One response to this trend has been the banding together of approximately four-fifths of the states in the Education Commission of the States in an effort to redirect some of the federal influence through the state, thus preserving, in the view of some, more local control. Yet even with its enlarged role in education the federal government has not been able to accomplish a great deal. Desegregation is not nearly accomplished in public education, either in the North or the South. Cities are victims of perennial crises, and their schools are in a state of deterioration. As pointed out by James Guthrie,[17] in spite of the national orientation of the President, the Congress remains, through its system of seniority and committee membership, supported occasionally by either *de facto* or *de jure* gerrymandering, a rural-oriented body.

Other Political Issues in Education

Even from the above discussion, all too brief to convince anyone of the magnitude of the political nature of education, let alone the theoretical and operational issues involved, it is clear that politics, always existing below the surface in education, has now been exposed to the view of those who care to look. To be sure, that portion seen is like an iceberg: the largest and most dangerous portion lies beneath the surface. Yet it is there for all to observe, study, or practice as they choose.

The concern for urban areas, particularly for urban education, has increased at every level of government. This concern has often manifested itself in politics and activity within levels and in the interrelationships between levels of political jurisdiction. In a recent book, *Toward Improving Urban Education*,[19] more than two-thirds of the 15 authors discuss the political aspects of urban educational issues ranging from the superintendent's role to the mayor's intervention in education; from the teachers' union to community control; and from financial problems of urban education to the dilemma of the urban building principal, each issue embedded in politics (albeit not always party politics).

Conclusion

American society at all levels is becoming increasingly secular and pluralistic. Its demands are more fragmented and its faith in the established systems of governance, including school boards, less stable. Meanwhile education retains its old and cherished myths that served much better in an earlier day. The vast majority of boards of education in the United States still operate in consensual voting patterns providing no public evidence that any portion of the board represents the opinions, beliefs, values, or needs of the minority regarding any issue. This consensus frequently emerges from nonpublic meetings of the board during which considerable disagreement may have occurred. Yet the public is not privy to these decisional processes. The board acts in the belief that the appearance of disunity on the board will undermine public confidence in it. This may be true when the board is operating in a *Gemeinschaft* community where values are sacred and monolithic in nature. But our nation has for the last twenty or thirty years been moving rapidly toward *Gesellschaft*, pluralistic and fragmented

7

opinions, values and needs. Perhaps the sacred behavior of school boards that lingers from yesterday's society deteriorates rather than bolsters public confidence in the governance of public education today.

Postscript

As this article is being prepared, political action by students across the United States is being felt on practically every college and university campus. Classes are being boycotted, sit-ins staged, windows smashed, buildings burned, students shot and killed. The most radical political action is occurring in education, and this action will not likely be confined to college campuses. It has already begun in the high schools and even the junior high schools across the nation. Not only adults but also students are losing faith in established governance patterns in education. In addition, they are using the schools to protest their lack of confidence in the other governing institutions of the United States. Whether or not the issues and problems have been generated by the schools, the schools will be required to provide effective responses. The issues are political, the demonstrations are political, and the responses required must be political in nature. There is not a more appropriate time for the members of the American Association of School Administrators to concern themselves with the "Politics of Education."

Footnotes

1. Laurence Iannaccone and Frank W. Lutz, *Politics, Power and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.) 1970, p. 1.

2. Daniel E. Griffiths, *et al.*, (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers) 1962, pp. 225-93.

3. Iannaccone and Lutz, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-66.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

5. Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, *State Politics and the Public Schools* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf) 1964, p. 275

6. Prepublication copy of the New York City School Board Decision-Making Processes book by Frank W. Lutz, Richard C. Lonsdale, and Harland Bloland.

7. *The Oregonian* (Portland, Oregon, newspaper) May 3, 1970, p. 1

8. For example, see Robert S. Lynd and Hellen M. Lynd, *Middletown and Middletown in Transition* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World) 1929-37; August B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth* (New York: John Wiley and Sons) 1949; Robert A. Dahl, *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press) 1961; and Wallace S. Sayer and Herbert Kaufman, *Governing New York City: Politics in the Metropolis* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation) 1960.

9. Robert S. Cahill and Stephen P. Hencley, (eds.), *The Politics of Education: In the Local Community* (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers) 1964; and Ralph B. Kimbrough, *Political Power and Educational Decision-Making* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company) 1964.

10. Iannaccone and Lutz, *op. cit.*

11. *Schoolmen in Politics* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press) 1962.

12. Masters, *op. cit.*

13. *The Politics in Education* (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education) 1967.

14. *Education and State Politics* (New York: Teachers College Press) 1969.

15. Usdan, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

16. Laurence Iannaccone, "The State Politics of Education" in *Toward Improving Urban Education*, (ed.) Frank W. Lutz (Columbus, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co.) 1970

17. Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.), *The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co.) 1969. Also Frank W. Lutz (ed.), *Toward Improving Urban Education* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co.) 1969.

18. "The Public Schools in a Federal Vise," *Toward Improving Urban Education*, *op. cit.*

19. *Ibid.*

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss the merits of the party system in American politics. But it is worth noting at the outset that between 1958 and 1968, the most significant Congressional action in education had virtually nothing to do with which party was in power.

It was a decade of dramatic and tragic events, each of which may be traced directly or indirectly to a generation of social complacency and educational neglect.

Consider October 1957, when the Russians launched the first man-made earth satellite. This event shoved aside the current partisan debate over federal funding of school construction and led to relatively quick passage of the National Defense Education Act—legislation designed to end a dangerous shortage of trained manpower in the fields of science and engineering.

"History will smile sardonically," said Robert M. Hutchins a year later, "at the spectacle of this great country's getting interested, slightly and temporarily, in education only because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education into the cold war and calling an education bill a defense bill."

Or consider November, 1963, when the assassination of President John F. Kennedy virtually neutralized partisan bickering over social legislation. The flood of social programs enacted in 1964 and 1965 must be attributed in part, at least, to the public wish to memorialize a fallen leader.

It should be noted, further, that by the end of the Eisenhower period, the roots of alienation and discord had been firmly planted. The failure —or should we say lack—of social policy since World War II had led to vicious cycles of poverty, weakened the holding power of public schools, and spawned a generation without faith in its own future.

We still live in the shadow of Sputnik, and we are still preoccupied with the race riots, assassinations, and student protests of the Sixties. The nation is still divided over the means of solving domestic problems, although there is general agreement on objectives. The national platforms of the major parties in 1960, 1964, and 1968, showed awareness of the mounting social crisis (see centerfold), but few of the grandiose solutions promised have been enacted. Of these, few have been funded adequately, if at all. A look at some of the major legislative efforts during the past decade will indicate why this is so.

General Federal Aid Stymied

A general aid-to-education bill came close to passage by Congress in 1960 but was killed when the House Rules Committee, by a 5-7 vote (D 5-3, R 0-4), refused to authorize a House-Senate conference that might have compromised differences on the provisions of the bill. Between June, when the Rules Committee voted, and September 1, when the 86th Congress adjourned, supporters of federal aid were unable to generate enough pressure to force final action on the legislation.

The Senate had passed a bill authorizing expenditures of $1.8 billion in grants to states for school construction and for teachers' salaries, the payments to be spread so that poorer states would receive more money than richer ones. The House passed a bill providing $1.3 billion in grants for school construction only, with no provisions to equalize payments. It also included a provision that schools receiving aid under the program must be open to students without discrimination.

1960 was the first year since

This article, "National Political Parties and Educational Policy Making," the second in a series on "Politics and Education," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by John M. Lumley, assistant executive secretary for government relations and citizenship, National Education Association.

1950 in which the Senate had passed a school construction bill and the first time the House had ever passed one. The Senate bill was passed by a substantial vote margin, but passage in the House was by a slim majority.

Even had the legislation not been blocked by a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats on the Rules Committee, its provision of direct grants to school districts was expected to run into a Presidential veto. Mr. Eisenhower in 1959 had proposed an education bill that represented a change of approach from his earlier programs. Rather than direct grants, as requested in the past, the President proposed that the Government help pay the costs of long-term school construction bonds over a period of 30-35 years. This was dubbed a "bankers' bill" by Democrats and never came close to passage. But the White House repeatedly warned of its opposition to the alternative—a program of direct grants that would be more short-run, but more costly in each year of its existence.

In addition to financing policy, the Administration and the Democrats disagreed about whether an education bill should provide aid for teachers' salaries. The Democrats (allied with many education interests) said it should—that in many areas need for higher salaries was greater than for more classrooms, and that states should have the option to spend the money. The President did not believe that the Federal Government "ought to be in the business of paying a local official."

The salary aid question developed into a major campaign issue in the 1960 Presidential race. Vice-President Nixon sided with President Eisenhower and said aid for teachers' salaries would invite dangerous federal control over what is taught. Senator Kennedy called for salary assistance as passed by the Senate, pointing out that the Federal Government had actually been aiding teachers' salaries under the impacted areas program (PL 874) since 1950, that about 60 percent of the nearly $2 billion that had been appropriated under the program went for salaries, and that there had been no complaints of federal control.

On February 20, 1961, President Kennedy sent to Congress an education message in which he requested grants of $2.3 billion over three years to be used by states primarily for school construction and increasing teachers' salaries; $2.8 billion for a five-year program of loans for college facilities construction; and grants of $892 million for four-year federal scholarships.

The President's message said that no elementary and secondary school funds were allocated for "constructing church schools or paying church school teacher salaries," and that this was in accordance with "the clear prohibition of the Constitution."

Catholic church leaders countered with a statement that the school aid bill should include private school

Excerpts from National

Republicans, 1960

The GOP declared that "each person possesses the right to education—it is his birthright in a free Republic." The party pledged federal support for school construction; stimulation of actions to update and strengthen vocational education; efforts to make adequate library facilities available to every citizen; continued support of programs to strengthen basic research in education; extension of the federal student loan and graduate fellowship program; consideration of means through the tax laws to help offset tuition costs; and matching grant to help states assess school needs.

Democrats, 1960

Lambasting Republicans for "eight years of neglect of our educational system," the Democrats proclaimed a national fiscal crisis. "We believe," they said, "that America can meet its educational obligations only with generous financial support, within the traditional framework of local control."

The Democratic platform promised federal support for such pressing needs as classroom construction and teachers' salaries; all phases of vocational education for youth and adults; educational television; and establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps for underprivileged young people.

Republicans, 1964

The 1964 GOP platform pledged "maximum restraint of federal intrusions into matters more productively left to the individual." The party promised selective aid to higher education, strengthened state and local tax resources, including tax credits for college education; resistance to "inverse discrimination, whether by the shifting of jobs, or the abandonment of neighborhood schools, for reasons of race," and establishment of "realistic priorities" for federal spending in education, job training, vocational rehabilitation, and educational research . . . "while resisting Democratic efforts to spend wastefully and indiscriminately."

Democrats, 1964

"Demands on the already inadequate sources of state and local revenues place a serious limitation on education," said the Democrats in 1964. "New methods of financial

loans or it should be defeated. President Kennedy, in a confrontation he had hoped to avoid, told a press conference he believed that "across-the-board" loans, as well as grants, to private schools were unconstitutional.

Thus, to the bill's anticipated foes in the House—conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats—was added the prospect of a sizeable number of the House's 88 Catholic members. Most of the Catholics were Northern Democrats who had voted for education bills in the past, but the bitterness of the 1961 controversy could force them into a position of having to vote against the President's bill unless private schools also were assisted.

Failure of the bill carried with it the construction and fellowship proposals and a bill to make substantive amendments to NDEA. All that survived in the session were simple extensions of NDEA and the impacted areas program.

Every proposal for federal aid to education failed in 1962. General aid for construction of public elementary and secondary schools, not to mention teachers' salaries, was doomed from the outset, still smarting from the religious school controversy that scotched it in 1961. Although the Administration renewed its request for such aid in 1962, no forceful attempt was made to enact it. The Administration also asked for college aid and for programs to deal with special education problems (such as adult illiteracy, handicapped children, medical and dental education, migrant workers, and aid to the arts). None of these programs were enacted, but Congress did send to the White House a bill providing construction grants for educational television and a sizeable increase in the budget for the National Science Foundation.

Beginnings of a Turnabout

"This session of the Congress will go down in history as the Education Congress of 1963," President Lyndon Johnson said December 16, as he signed the Higher Education Facilities Act. This was one of five major bills enacted in 1963, which together authorized more than $2 billion for federal education assistance requested in January by President Kennedy.

Most of the programs that were enacted received bipartisan support. Public school aid, however, which had always aroused strong opposition, never came out of committee in 1963. The President attempted to gain support for this program by departing from the old across-the-board approach and earmarking funds for areas of critical need and for starting and maximum teachers' salaries, but these efforts were unsuccessful. He also replaced past requests for federal scholarships with three recommendations: expanded NDEA student loans, federal insurance for commercial loans, and a study group to assess the needs for scholarships.

Party Platforms, 1960-1968

aid must be explored, including the channeling of federally-collected revenues to all levels of education, and, to the extent permitted by the Constitution, to all schools."

The platform called for a wide variety of educational opportunities for young people entering a labor market with fewer and fewer places for the unskilled.

The 1964 platform also stressed increased spending for preschool training as well as junior college, college, and postgraduate study.

Republicans, 1968

A key GOP proposal in 1968 was the creation of a national commission to study the quality and relevance of American education. This proposal was coupled with specific program objectives, including: expanded, better programs for preschool children; establishment of state, local, or private programs of teacher training, expansion of post-secondary technical institutes to enable young people to acquire satisfactory skills for "meaningful employment"; an industry youth program, coupled with a flexible approach to minimum wage laws for young entry-level workers during their training periods.

The 1968 platform also called for state plans for federal assistance which would include state distribution of such aid to nonpublic school children.

Democrats, 1968

Democrats in 1968 declared that every citizen has a basic right to as much education and training as he desires and can master—from preschool through graduate studies—even if his family cannot pay for his education. The platform pledged attainment of this goal while safeguarding state-local control over the nation's educational system.

Specific aims include expansion of preschool programs to prepare all young children for full participation in formal education; improved teacher recruitment and training programs for inner city and rural schools and the Teacher Corps; and improvements in vocational and adult programs.

The platform also pledged full funding of ESEA Title I (programs for the disadvantaged), enlargement of the federal scholarship and student loan programs, and efforts to ease the home owner's tax burden.

Only expansion of the time-tested student loan program was enacted.

Another 1963 strategy innovation by the Kennedy Administration was to put all of the requests together in an omnibus bill. The idea was to build the broadest possible base of support for the program and unite all of the interested lobby groups behind one bill. The various groups' rivalries and interests had led to divisions in support which helped to defeat individual bills.

The omnibus bill was greeted with some misgivings on Capitol Hill. The House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over education legislation held hearings on the proposal, but eventually broke it into several parts.

In addition to the college facilities bill, Congress in 1963 passed a major vocational education bill, a one-year extension of NDEA (with increased student loans), a two-year extension of the impacted areas program, and funding for training teachers of the handicapped.

The Breakthrough—ESEA

Despite the repeated failure of general aid measures in the Eisenhower and Kennedy years, a series of bills to meet urgent national needs was passed. Spurred by the success of these bills and by heightened public awareness of social injustices, the Johnson Administration set out to plan a broad attack on poverty and ignorance.

The climate was right, and the rhetoric appealing. The President appointed a series of task forces to develop a series of legislative proposals for 1965. The task force on education, headed by John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation, came up with proposals which led to the drafting of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Gardner task force and the leadership of the Office of Education met with agency heads, key congressional figures, and representatives of NEA, the AASA, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and other professional and social organizations. The outcome of this joint effort was authorization of the first broad-based school aid in the nation's history.

President Johnson's victory was made possible after he abandoned the traditional proposals for teachers' salaries and school construction, asking instead for specialized aid for districts with high concentrations of low-income families. Private schools were permitted to share in some of the federally aided services, such as shared time projects, educational television, and loans of textbooks and other teaching materials. The bill also authorized funds for supplementary centers and services, increased educational research, and programs to strengthen state education agencies. Subsequent amendments added provisions for education of the handicapped, bilingual education programs, and dropout prevention projects.

ESEA has been a highly visible and generally popular program, although judgments vary as to its effectiveness in equalizing educational opportunity. Funding has been a persistent problem, largely because of the expenses of war in Southeast Asia, partly because of renewed disagreements over policies in public school finance.

Mr. Nixon Meets the Educators

The educational priorities of the Nixon Administration were made clear in the President's revised budget for Fiscal 1970, which cut the Johnson education request by some $370 million. The response of the education community was immediate: in April 1969, NEA brought together 70 education organizations, including AASA, to influence the Congress on behalf of the nation's students and teachers. The Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Federal Education Programs was the result of this effort. The Committee was soon to be called, by its opponents, one of the most potent lobbies on Capitol Hill.

The Emergency Committee flooded Washington with thousands of teachers, administrators, school librarians, and students to persuade Congress that the schools needed vastly more money than the Administration had requested. Rallying behind Rep. Charles S. Joelson (D-N.J.), the educators succeeded in adding more than $1 billion to the Administration budget. The President vetoed the appropriation bill, but agreed to a final compromise that put the education budget for 1969/70 about $800 million over his initial request.

The point was thus made that a united teaching profession could, if it wished, exert a great influence on the setting of national spending priorities. And it is really up to educators to convince political leaders that the great mass of American people want more money spent on education. For once public education has been made as much a federal responsibility as national defense or highways; more money than was ever dreamed of will be spent on it.

12

Number Three

"To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging of any educational course is, to judge in what degree it discharges such function."

Herbert Spencer, in the quotation given above, has provided an appropriate touchstone for our use in assessing and evaluating the role of interest groups in the formulation of public policy at the federal level.

Before it can be applied, however, it would be well to review some of the basic conventions of the democratic process of decision making. Just as war is too important to be left to the generals, so too, in the mind of the American citizen, is deeply entrenched the conviction that education cannot be left *solely* to the educators. It is an area of concern to all, and for that reason, despite what we will, actions in this area are essentially political actions. Whether we like it or not, proposals originating in the academic disciplines are subject to examination and revision by the laity, acting through the mechanisims of our political and governmental institutions.

Given these parameters, accepting these "rules of the game," how can the varied voices of the professional groups be so orchestrated as to carry conviction and thus gain acceptance of the specific proposals being advanced?

The formal decisions in our society are clothed in the terms of authorizing statutes, such as the language of PL 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended. These laws are the end result of a process of repeated examination and clarification by technicians and officials in both the Executive and Legislative branches of government, and by all who have participated through testimony given during the public hearings. These activities characterize the committee stage, which is the major step in both House and Senate, of the legislative process. The statutes, when enacted, are declarations of public policy attesting to the fact that a constitutionally valid need exists. The need, then, has a legitimate claim upon the public resources to the extent of the dollar limit contained in those sections of the act which authorize the appropriation of funds.

The public law further sets forth the terms and conditions within which the Executive branch must operate as it expends the funds (which are separately appropriated), to accomplish the intent of the legislation. The authorizing statute, or substantive law, in effect, sets forth the maximum claim which may be made upon the Treasury of the United States to meet a need which has been justified to the satisfaction of the elected officials of our government, the President, and the majority of the members of each chamber. The annual appropriations acts for the departments and the agencies of the Executive branch, by contrast, are the public laws which are, in effect, checks drawn to pay for the buying of goods and services which the authorizing legislation has established as proper uses for federal funds. The annual appropriations acts, in a sense, ration the available federal resources annually among the valid competative claims which have been recognized as legitimate.

It goes without saying that these processes do not occur in a vacuum. By formal action, 537 men and women—the President, the vice-president (in his capacity as president of the Senate) 100 senators, 435 members of the House of Representatives—all to some degree must have been consulted and a majority of the

---

Charles W. Lee, executive director, Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Federal Education Programs, Washington, D.C., prepared this article, "Interest Groups and Federal Education Policy," for *The School Administrator*. It is the third in a series of 12 essays on the general subject "Politics and Education."

legislators must have given approval to a course of action before it can take effect.

Thus, formally, federal educational policy can be developed only within the limits set forth by statute. It is important to note that both the authorizing acts and the appropriations acts influence educational policy; the former by establishing the outer limits of permissable action, and the latter by restrictions placed on uses of funds, either by legislative rider or by a failure to fund certain provisions of the authorizing statutes.

The Executive branch, through the recommendations prepared for the President by the Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the White House establishment—particularly that part concerned with the preparation of the budget—play a major role in the advancement of policy positions. But, under our system, it is the Congress which decides (with the concurrence in the end result by the President), upon the educational policy which shall control from the federal standpoint.

Implicit in the procedures sketched above are certain points of relevance to the groups concerned with the direction and scope of federal educational policy.

- In both the Legislative branch and the Executive branch, proposals are, by a great many individuals, hammered out through a process of compromise and conciliation which seeks to assure that the end result is one that can be lived with . . . that the programs developed are operable. At every level through their national staffs, interest groups can exercise great influence in providing rationally based data.

- Automatic mechanisims are built into the legislation assuring that, once adopted, there will be periodic review of the effect of the programs enacted. This is accomplished usually by giving a statute only a one-year, two-year, or more rarely, a three-year authorization before reauthorization must be sought. This means that feedback about program operations must be organized and evaluated. The data collection activity of interest groups can be very helpful as their insights from the field of activity contribute to testimony offered.

- Access procedures are built into the process through the public hearings on both substantive and appropriations measures and through the right of any legislator to offer modifying amendments during floor consideration of the bills. The establishment of communications by representatives of interest groups with all legislators is necessary to assure thorough consideration of their suggestions by both chambers.

Since decisions in our democracy are made by elected representatives who are not necessarily professionally qualified in specific subject matter areas, what factors enter into their calculations to support or oppose a particular concept?

Two kinds of information are available to the conscientious legislator:

- Formal information, including (a) the hearings record, in which is set forth the justifications of the Executive branch, the testimony of all other witnesses who have been heard or who have filed statements in support or opposition to the specific proposals; (b) the committee report which contains committee argument, section analysis, and comparison prints of the changes in existing law if the proposals were to be adopted; and, (c) the floor debates in the other body if the measure under consideration has already passed as an act of either the House or Senate; and

- Informal information, consisting largely of communications, written or oral, received by the legislator directly from his own constituents who have taken the time and trouble to apprise him of how they view the proposed legislation.

While by no means ought the formal information areas to be downgraded, since by their very nature they represent the distillate of much rationality and endeavour on the part of knowledgeable and competent men and women, I suggest that the informal pattern is equally important, since politicians who remain in office long enough to become statesmen do so because they have been very sensitive to the needs, wants, and aspirations of their own constituents, and have done their best to satisfy these desires over the period of their legislative service.

So interest groups—in the context of this article I mean the professional associations of educators, such as the AASA, and their allies, the broad aggregates oriented primarily to the public interest, such as the Parent-Teacher Associations, the AFL-CIO unions, and the business and industrial trade associations concerned with products used in the educational process—while they seek to gain acceptance of their viewpoints within the Executive branch and have them adopted as part of the program of the President, should also be alert to, and actively work in, the arena of the legislative process in both its substantive and funding aspects.

How can this latter best be done? With this question we approach the center and the heart of the matter. We are really envisioning an information network with a two-way interchange. Mechanisms within each association should be established or strengthened which would bring timely, detailed information about what is happening in the halls of Congress to the field professional. This will enable him to analyze the effect upon his own operation of the adoption of the proposed policy. He then might communicate directly his reactions to his own three spokesmen in the Congress (one representative and two senators), together with his recommendations for such changes or modifications which in his judgment are needed to accomp-

lish the goal he desires with a minimum of disruption and delay.

Time is generally of the essence. A cycle of triggered response within 24 hours, at the most, is highly desirable. Nothing is more frustrating to a congressman or a senator than to learn that his own people are upset about a proposal two days after he has cast his vote for it. He feels, and quite properly, that if opposition is not voiced against a proposition in a timely manner, that he has been let down and placed in a very untenable position. Consequently, he is less likely to give full weight to the objections and exert himself to retrieve the situation. The adage on the relative merits of an ounce of prevention and a pound of cure applies.

Communication is critically important. Communication is the thread that ties members of the association together and gives unity to the association. Relationships depend on it, and concerted action on any problem or issue cannot take place without it. Good communication cannot be attained on an accidental or even an incidental basis. It must be carefully planned and consistently supported with an element of flexibility that will take care of emergency situations.

In the 1965 annual report of the Carnegie Foundation John Gardner said, "We have all seen men with lots of bright ideas but with no patience with the machinery by which ideas are translated into action. As a rule the machinery defeats them. It is a pity because men can play a very useful role, but too often they are dilettantes. They dip in here or there. They give bits of advice on a dozen fronts. They never get their hands dirty working with one piece of the machinery until they know it well. They will not take the time to understand the institutions and processes by which change is accomplished."

Not long ago Barbara Ward said "No humane or ethical society can expect to survive if its people refuse to accept the consequences of their acts. To strike blindly or to damage with indifference to the total results of our action are hallmarks or irresponsibility." Therefore, it seems to me that professional associations must be ready to act, must know how to act and must be prepared to accept the consequences of action.

It seems to me that state associations of school administrators will be stronger and will function to best advantage when—

- General agreement is reached on what the membership wants to do, can do, and is willing to do; when immediate objectives are defined clearly, long-range goals are established, and priorities are fixed.

- The diversity of interests, concerns, and needs that exist in the membership is regarded as a strength and an asset rather than as a weakness and a liability.

- Every member is actively involved in the work of the association.

- Every member has an opportunity to assume some leadership responsibilities.

- The association is committed to jobs and purposes that call for resources and effort exceeding the powers of individual members.

- The association is continually pushing forward for new frontiers.

Of all of the profound desires sought by men, few rival the American man's passion for collective improvement. Few desires have come closer to realization, and it seems to me that one of the most pronounced developments in the profession of school administration and potentially one of the most potent influences for the improvement of the profession are state associations of school administrators. Men with a common purpose, men confronted by problems and issues and aware of opportunities, men abused and harassed by vested interests, and men imbued with the desire to serve mankind have banded together and have assumed the burden of responsibility for what happens to the profession. No longer need each man fight the lonely battle in isolated outposts. Today state associations in nearly every state of the nation provide the machinery, the avenue, the opportunity for men and women to have an active part in shaping the dream and the destiny of school administration in public education.

Annual federal expenditures for Office of Education programs alone now total in excess of $4.4 billion a year, a substantial part of which affects elementary and secondary school operations. If fully funded, the current operative laws would require slightly over $13.1 billion a year to be expended annually.

Given the increasing difficulty of raising money from local and state tax resources, the federal share of the financing of the education of American citizens can be increased from its present level of slightly more than 6.8 percent of the total annual cost, about $64 billion, to a more equitable level of one-third or one-half of the amounts needed. While this might mean an expansion of the authorizing statutes and the creation of new modes of channeling resources to the local areas, and certainly would mean significant increases in the appropriations level, let us remember that an increase of only $500 per child in central city and rural schools, to bring them up to the expenditure level of our better suburban schools, if we heed the Riles Report recommendations, would cost $35 billion more than we now fund from the federal Treasury for all existing programs. Money of this magnitude, however, ought not be considered as an annual expenditure item. Rather, it is a capital investment which will return dividends many times over the cost in the relatively near future.

We might well ask if we can afford not to make this type of investment in the future of the country. It cannot happen, however, unless

15

dedicated men and women in each Congressional District take the time and the trouble to lobby in the public interest to obtain the money necessary to buy the needed educational goods and services to equip their children to meet the challenges of our society in the next four decades.

Untapped and unrefined ore exists only as a potential resource, to become useful in the service of the nation. Men, machines, money, and management must be skillfully employed to produce the tools and artifacts that are the material basis of a civilized society. The situation is much the same with regard to the intellectual resources of the nation. Almost half of our population is attending school. Unless we are willing to provide the men, machines, money, and management needed to bring each of these young citizens to a full and productive life, to a full realization of the inherent talents and capabilities with which each is endowed, we will be forced to answer when we are called to account for our trusteeship. We will have failed to prepare our children for complete living.

Politics is the practical exercise of the art of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government; somebody must study it and learn the art, and exercise patience and sympathy and skill to bring the multitude of opinions and wishes of self-governing people into such order that some prevailing opinion may be expressed and peaceably accepted. Otherwise, confusion will result either in dictatorship or in anarchy. The principal ground of reproach against any American citizen should be that he is not a politician. Everyone ought to be, as Lincoln was.

* Spencer, Herbert. *Education*. New York: Appleton and Co., 1896.

16

Number Four

Our three level federal system in which powers and functions are shared among national, state, and local governments is in serious crisis and disarray. The Committee for Economic Development in its recent report, *Modernizing State Government,* acknowledged that there was "some validity in the facetious comment that our three-level federalism leaves the national government with the money, local governments with the problems, and the states with the legal powers."

The crisis in federalism is particularly acute at the state level, theoretically, at least, "the keystone in the arch of the federal system—the bridge between local governments concerned with community problems and a central government dealing with nationwide issues." The structural and functional weaknesses of the states have been a salient factor in precipitating the crisis in interlevel governmental relationships which currently exists. Many of the states for a variety of reasons have virtually abdicated responsibility for the nation's burgeoning urban problems. As a result, metropolitan centers have had to bypass the states and turn to the federal government for assistance in confronting myriad problems like housing, welfare, air and water pollution, education, and transportation.

The immediate priority, if the states are to become responsive to the needs of a society in which three of four Americans live in metropolitan areas, is to undertake on a national scale a massive and comprehensive revitalization and modernization of state government. It is perhaps easy to agree that Washington, D.C. with its stifling bureaucracies is not the fount of all wisdom and that decision-making should be decentralized in a large, heterogeneous nation with more than 200 million citizens. A critically important concomitant of this view, however, frequently is not enunciated explicitly; that is the desperate need to strengthen state and local governments so that they have the capacity to discharge the responsibilities which many who fear the accretion of federal power want them to have. The strengthening of the states is of particular significance at a time when there is growing disaffection with duplicative, confusing and proliferating federal grants-in-aid programs.

The weaknesses of state government are of particular importance in a policy area like education where the states traditionally have had paramount legal responsibility and authority. The state's legal primacy in education makes any lack of responsiveness on the part of state government to the educational needs of an increasingly urbanized society particularly significant. Indeed, the state legislature has almost complete power over public education except where there are specific restrictions implicit in the state constitution. The weaknesses of state legislatures thus have particular saliency to those who would advocate greater state initiatives in ameliorating the urban crisis. James Bryce, some 75 years ago, was reported to have commented that the convening of the state legislature "is looked forward to with anxiety by good citizens" and "its departure hailed as a deliverance." These apprehensions unfortunately would still be well founded in more than a few states. The low visibility and lackluster performances of state legislatures have been discussed frequently and the following from *Modernizing State Government* encapsulates some of their weaknesses:

> Before 1962, state legislatures had become *increasingly unrepresentative in composition*—a

---

Michael D. Usdan, professor of education, The City University of New York, New York, prepared this article, "Relationships Between Federal and State Systems," for *The School Administrator.* **It is the fourth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject "Politics and Education."**

condition that recent reapportionments have helped to correct.

Such factors as extremely low pay, severely limited legislative sessions, and lack of adequate staff or supporting research competence have led to low esteem for legislatures and loss of confidence in the resulting product.

Many legislatures are unwieldly in size, which detracts from the prestige of membership in them.

Undue attention is often given to detailed examination of administrative operations, petty local issues, and financial aspects of minor state operations—diverting energies from major policy matters.

The influence of pervasive and powerful legislative lobbies is notorious, even though the frequency of bribery and unseemly revelry has been exaggerated.

Perhaps these endemic weaknesses of state legislatures can be emphasized most dramatically by mentioning one estimate which indicates that it costs only about twice as much money to operate the entire U.S. Congress as it does to run all fifty state legislatures.

The structural and functional weaknesses of the states are rather pervasive and extend into the executive and judicial as well as the legislative branch of government. It is, of course, difficult to generalize about fifty complex and variegated jurisdictions but a cluster of governmental maladies are common to many of the states. The governors, for example, frequently have lacked authority commensurate with their responsibilities. Reflecting the fear of strong executives which dates from colonial times, many governors suffer from "balkanized" authority and must preside uneasily and relatively powerlessly over a fragmented variety of quasi-independent or even autonomous commissions and boards.

Other weaknesses of the states can be cited. Many state constitutions, reflecting late nineteenth century norms that the government is best which governs least, are inflexible, confining, and overly detailed documents. These archaic state constitutions frequently impose totally unrealistic fiscal constraints and are extremely difficult to amend. They are anachronistic deterrents to attempts to make states more responsive to contemporary needs. The judicial role of the states has been subordinate to that of the federal government as the result of numerous U.S. Supreme Court decisions dating back to John Marshall's time. These decisions have consistently upheld the extension of federal authority and primacy. The national impact of federal court decisions on the volatile racial desegregation issue has been profound. The great influence of these decisions upon state and local educational officials requires little elaboration. As the result of court decisions, the federal government since passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has intervened in unprecedented fashion in school matters. These federal interventions have generated widespread political controversy. The issue of school desegregation has become, both in *de jure* segregated communities of the South and *de facto* segregated communities of the North, one of the nation's most explosive domestic problems. The federal government's judicial and executive initiatives and dominant role in this issue continue to transform dramatically federal-state-local relationships in education.

The status of the states vis-a-vis the federal government also has suffered because state political parties lack the visibility of their national counterparts. State issues are diffused and the responsibilities of state officials are heavily administrative in character. State government lacks glamor and thus fails to attract the press and television coverage that accrues to more dramatic issues at the federal level where the President wrestles daily with the transcendent issue of war and peace. These factors and others generate public apathy and diminish concern for "atomized" and "erratic" state politics.

Not surprisingly, these general weaknesses of state government are reflected in the performances of state agencies like education departments. Despite the considerable boost given to state educational agencies by passage of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), glaring weaknesses still abound. Most state departments of education are still understaffed and lack the personnel with the expertise to discharge adequately responsibilities in areas like educational planning, evaluation, training, research and development. Perhaps the greatest challenge to state agencies, which commonly have been staffed by rurally oriented educators, is the establishment of closer relationships with problem plagued urban school systems.

The modernization of state educational agencies will be a difficult and tedious job requiring superior leadership. Chances for successfully converting these departments, which traditionally have performed maintenance or regulatory functions, into dynamic instrumentalities of educational leadership and reform will be largely contingent upon the invigoration of state government in general and the quality of leadership offered by the chief state school officer. Methods of selection of these officials thus become significant. Although in 30 of the states chief school officers are appointed by either the state board of education (26 states) or by the governor (4 states), 20 of the states still elect their top educational official. In 15 of these 20 states, the state superintendent or commissioner of education is elected on a partisan political ballot. In many of these states with elected chief school officers, there is no civil service status or protection for departmental staff and it can reasonably be argued that top quality educators are loath to have their careers determined by the vagaries of partisan politics. With greater federal moneys being dispensed in recent years to the states,

the arguments for having a nonpartisan state educational agency do not require elaboration here.

I have dwelled at such length upon the weaknesses of what John F. Kennedy called "the shame of the states" because a meaningful discussion of federal-state relationships must be predicated upon a realistic assessment of the current capacity of state governments. The states undeniably have been strengthened in recent years, paradoxically, as the result of the infusion of federal dollars and programs. The critical question, however, remains as to whether the nation with its urban centers rotting can afford the luxury of waiting for the states to be tooled up to cope more effectively with education and society's other pressing problems?

One transcendent issue is compelling a reassessment of the entire structure of educational decision-making; this issue, of course, is school finance. The crisis in school finance permeates federal-state relationships. The financing of education, the largest functional category of state spending, is the most critical issue facing many state governments. Money is a great source of power in government and the 16th amendment has provided the federal government with the powerful weapon of the graduated income tax. With the federal government collecting two of every three tax dollars and yet supporting well under 10 percent of the bill for elementary-secondary education, the fiscal burden has remained with local and state governments. While the federal government has preempted the more elastic graduated income tax, local governments which still pay on a national average 50 percent of the cost of public education are constrained by relatively static revenue sources. The property tax, still the bellwether of school finance as it was fifty and seventy-five years ago when it truly reflected wealth in a more rural economy, has reached the saturation point in many communities. In recent years an unprecedented number of defeats for school budgets and bond issues have dramatized the need to reform an anachronistic tax and revenue structure.

The fragmented and ineffectual political structures and limited sources of revenue which hamstring local governments make grassroots fiscal reform extremely unlikely. The formidable political obstacles, for example, to imposing sales or income taxes on a local, metropolitan or regional area basis are apparent. Many feel that only the state and federal governments have broad enough tax bases to implement much needed tax and revenue reform to redress gross fiscal inequities in education and other social policy areas. Indeed, there is substantial opinion that political configurations even at the state level preclude meaningful fiscal reform. State politics like local politics, it is maintained, tends to be tax politics while federal politics can more readily be programmatic. It is more difficult, some contend, for special powerful interest groups to dominate tax policy at the federal level than it is to control smaller political units at the local and state levels.

The school finance crisis at the local level is being exacerbated by rising teacher militancy which is further straining already saturated property tax rates. Instructional costs compose better than 70 percent of most school budgets, and the recent aggressiveness of once relatively pliant teacher organizations is rapidly pushing local communities beyond their fiscal breaking points. The time-consuming and strenuous demands of the negotiations process and the inadequacies of most local boards of education to cope with them may push the level of teacher negotiations to the regional, metropolitan, state, or even federal level faster than many imagine.

Several influential leaders recently have discussed the need for at least considering the possibility of eliminating locally levied school taxes. In the summer of 1968, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen, Jr., while still serving as New York's chief state school officer, floated a controversial "trial balloon" that the states assume the responsibility for financing education. In Dr. Allen's view, local financing of the elementary and secondary schools erects "serious barriers" to the solution of high priority urban problems like racial integration and decentralization. Dr. Allen, as predicted, elicited "a high mark on the educational seismograph" with his comments.

More recently, Michigan's Governor suggested that the burden for financing education be assumed by the state.

In the past few years momentum has been slowly building up for the states to assume total financial responsibility for education. After years of legislative frustration, some now look to the courts for relief of inequities. In a case of great import, the Detroit Board of Education sued the state of Michigan for violating the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Similar litigation is in process in California and elsewhere and the implications of these cases are indeed profound.

If at least a modicum of credence is to be placed in the adage that "he who pays the piper calls the tune," it is apparent that a necessary corollary to increases in federal and state financing of education would be the need to strengthen state education departments to assume new and greatly enlarged responsibilities. Until very recently many state educational agencies, as we have indicated, have been ineffectual and understaffed. Contrary to the views of many, federal programs have not weakened state education departments but have provided them with a large percentage of whatever staff they may possess. In 1968, C. O. Fitzwater, in *State School System Development*, wrote:

In 1947-48 vocational educa-

tion and vocational rehabilitation accounted for more than half the total department professional staff in at least 33 states. Only five departments had more than 50 professionals in other fields of education and 19 departments had fewer than 20.

New Federal programs begun during the 1950's accentuated the trend. By 1960 more than half the professional staff in all departments combined were assigned to federally subsidized programs; in 13 states the proportion was over 70 percent.

As recently as 1962, only 10 departments had professional staffs which totaled more than 100, 21 departments had fewer than 50 professionals.

Many are concerned that increases in federal aid for education, the U.S. Office of Education budget soared from $700 million in fiscal 1962 to $4 billion in fiscal 1967 (almost a 600 percent increase in five years), inevitably will result in the erosion of local and state prerogatives in formulating educational policy. These apprehensions reflect a misunderstanding of our federal system. More federal aid, as the foregoing statistics on state education department staffing indicate, does not necessarily mean a diminution of state power. Indeed, federal educational dollars like federal grants-in-aid have strengthened the states despite bureaucratic restrictions.

It must be stressed that power in our federal system is not a zero sum game, where, for example, if the federal level gains authority, the states must necessarily lose authority. Indeed, the history of federal grants-in-aid indicates that state authority grows as the result of this funding. Our three level governmental system, to cite Morton Grodzin's metaphor, resembles a "marble" or rainbow cake and not the separate sections of a layer cake. Functions, in other words, are not discrete. They are shared or mixed as each governmental level influences and interacts with the other levels. It is important to note, however, that although federal programs certainly have expanded the administrative functions of the states, the national government has been setting the agenda on many policy questions.

What of the future? Is the gravitational pull of authority to Washington, D.C., irreversible? Can the states begin to assume policy initiatives as the linchpins of a three level governmental system and not be mere administrative conduits for national programs? Is it reasonable to expect relationships in the federal system ever to conform to Terry Sanford's idealization:

> The national government is positioned to look at problems and programs in broad, general, aggregate terms of national policy and purposes. Local communities see the world in narrow, particular, individual terms, and should. This is their beauty. The states, as regions — territorial entities — are the means by which these two points of view can be brought together in the service of the citizens.

The growing centralization of power at the national level is of concern to all Americans regardless of political persuasion. Some share the late Senator Dirksen's concern that the continued attrition of the states soon will bring the time when "the only people interested in state boundaries will be Rand McNally." Even those who support the rapid expansion of federal social legislation and feel that it is too late to reform the states, fear the dangers of the "administrative monstrosity" which results from centralized bureaucracies operating programs affecting millions of citizens. What then is the solution, in a pluralistic society, to the current crisis of federalism?

There are those who have advocated replacing the outmoded states with regional authorities. The states, however, cannot be expected to disappear. For better or worse, they are too much a part of the "warp and woof of our national political fabric." Reports of the demise of the states, common during the zenith of the Great Society in the mid-nineteen sixties, have proven to be premature.

Since one must assume that the states are here to stay, their renaissance and revitalization becomes a national necessity.

Some of our major metropolitan problems like air and water pollution and transportation admittedly transcend state geographical boundaries.

With the reported interest of the Nixon Administration in reviving the concept of revenue sharing and regional commissions as means of redistributing federal revenue to the other levels of government, the states may now have another opportunity to become more assertive and substantive participants in the federal system. Indeed, in recent years there have been generated some encouraging attempts to strengthen the various components of state government. More visible and concerted efforts are being made by foundations, academicians, citizens groups, and legislators themselves to modernize the states. More specifically, in terms of strengthening the role of the states in shaping educational policy, the Education Commission of the States was created in 1966. The Commission, a voluntary, interstate, cooperative organization of growing significance, already has a membership of more than forty states with top level political and educational leaders involved in its expanding activities.

The decade of the 1970's may well see either a dynamic renaissance of the states, or if they continue not to fulfill their responsibilities, a total and perhaps irrevocable centralization of authority in the federal government. American education will be greatly influenced by the developments which will occur.

Number Five

It used to be that city schools exemplified all that was thought to be good about education. Their services were avidly sought by middle class parents, and they acted as ladders for the upward mobiliy of millions of children from lower class and immigrant families. Beginning in the World War II period, this favored position began to fade. Many middle income families left for the suburbs, and those that stayed behind moved in large numbers to acquire private and parochial schooling for their children. For the students who remained, mostly the offspring of the poor, public schools were no longer even neutral agents in assisting their pursuit of the American dream. Rather, in all too many cases, inner city schools became forces which worked actively to discourage aspirations.

A number of nationwide social and economic movements are in part the cause of the decline in quality of urban schools. However, a portion of the blame must also be borne by the traditional tendency of state governments to favor rural interests. The societywide causes are well understood by most educators, and, in any event, they are too complex to be described adequately here. Therefore, we will concentrate in this article on the linkage between state governments and city schools. We first will analyze several historical features of this set of intergovernmental relations, then suggest some possible paths of reform, and conclude by commenting upon the role school administrators have played in the conflict between state and city.

The Way It Used To Be

Up until the Depression and World War II, central cities held a favored financial position; relative to other geographic areas, they contained the largest concentrations of wealth within individual states. In most instances, this financial base was sufficient to provide adequate support for the public schools of the time. However, rurally dominated state legislatures were not in the least reluctant to tap this plentiful resource for other needs. Cities were regarded as great financial cows to be milked for the benefit of the remainder of the state.

While funds were being siphoned generally from the cities, state school finance arrangements were simultaneously shortchanging urban schools. State aid formulas favored rural areas. (Later, these same formulas were to favor suburban areas as well.) Simply put, cities paid proportionately more taxes to the state and received proportionately less revenues from the state for support of schools.

Being underrepresented in the chambers of state government, there was little that city residents could do about this financial discrimination. However, in some states, large urban property owners banded together and managed to obtain personal access to state legislatures. They succeeded in gaining enactment of tax regulations concerning city property which were far more restrictive than the rules which applied to noncity school districts.[1] The end result of these legislative actions in behalf of the special interests of property owners was to limit the access of city schools to their own tax base.

In addition to matters concerned with school finance, rural domination of state governments resulted in several other forms of discrimination against city schools. For example, in the historical periods when city schools were grappling with educational problems accompanying the influx of large numbers of foreign immigrants, many of whom could not

---

James W. Guthrie, assistant professor and director, Urban Education Program, University of California, Berkeley, prepared this article, "The States and Urban School Systems," for *The School Administrator*. It is the fifth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."

speak English, and with revisions of the school curriculum necessitated by expanding industrialization and technology, state education departments typically were staffed by individuals whose experience and interests rested with rural schools where the problems were of a different sort. Thus, city school districts were left to suffer with their own peculiar troubles while small town and rural districts enjoyed almost exclusive access to the supplementary services and support of an organization funded by, and ostensibly designed to serve, all school districts in a state.

The Way It Came To Be

So long as cities maintained a healthy tax base relative to other geographic areas in a state, and so long as urban populations were not disproportionately weighted toward the poor and the socially oppressed, city schools survived and in many instances even flourished. However, with the onset of World War I, one of the largest human migrations in history began to upset this balance. Literally millions of Puerto Ricans and southern Negroes began to move to the cities, particularly to cities in the North. They were attracted by the prospect of wartime jobs and the hope of escaping the squalor and discrimination which otherwise would have been their fate. This remarkable exodus was stimulated greatly by World War II and the period of sustained economic progress which followed.

While the human tide from the South poured into the cities, a labyrinth of ill-conceived national policies regarding housing, transportation, and taxation encouraged waves of middle class city residents to move to the suburbs. Now, the image of the city schools began to change. What was once an adequate tax base became inadequate when faced with the intensive schooling needs of the new population. School support problems became even worse as the cities' taxable resources began to erode. What was once income-producing property began to disappear for freeways and nontaxable institutions such as public housing, hospitals, and universities. The problem was further compounded when industry began to bypass the city in favor of new sites in the suburbs where the surroundings were cleaner, the taxes lower, and the workforce better educated.

This massive movement of people and resources into and out of cities did little to improve the political power of cities vis-a-vis other areas. The "one man, one vote" decisions of the early 1960's [2] began to redress the political representation disparities which had previously favored rural and agricultural interests, but these decisions did not aid city residents. For the most part, reapportionment accrued to the political advantage of the suburbs. The 1970 census figures seem to confirm this advantage; for the first time, the communities which ring central cities now surpass them in total population. (However, in a surprising fashion which we will comment upon later, this shift of population and political power may ultimately help city schools.)

It is interesting to note that population and resource shifts between cities and suburbs have not only taken place at the expense of cities' relative political power, but have also affected the allocation of political power within city school systems. The outward flow of middle class households created a temporary power vacuum. Without any countervailing force, highly organized and militant teacher unions filled the gap and were able to gain substantial improvements in salary and working conditions. Now that poor white, Negro, and Puerto Rican parents are coming to be politically more sophisticated and increasingly aware of the value of schooling for their children, it will be interesting to observe whether inroads will be made upon the bargaining power of teacher unions. In part, the growing struggle over decentralization of city school districts reflects this tension between teachers and newly awakened minority groups.

What the Cities Have Done

In the absence of sufficient legislative representation to gain state assistance for their economic and organizational difficulties, city schools have resorted to a variety of patchwork political tactics. Most of the large cities maintain one or more lobbyists in the state capital, who are responsible for advocating city schools' interests with the legislature, governor, and state board and department of education. Generally, these individuals are skilled at their trade, and they provide a clear-cut assist for urban school systems.

Their lobbying efforts are supplemented in most states by coalitions of city school board members and urban school administrators. Such groups may have a full-time executive director who promotes research depicting the city schools' plight and who may himself act as a lobbyist. Moreover, almost every big city school superintendent has close ties with key state legislators representing his city, and on school issues they are generally most sympathetic to the concerns of urban areas.

However, none of these specialized political activities appear to be able to overcome the educational disparities and deficits which have built up over several decades of legislative neglect of urban areas. Despite the success of city school system advocates in obtaining minor financial distribution formula changes such as "urban factors" and "population density multipliers," [3] recent surveys demonstrate that many states still allocate more aid per pupil to suburban districts than to central cities.[4]

From Where Will Help Come?

Existing federal school aid programs show little promise of solving city problems. For example, despite the existence of ESEA Title I, it is not clear that federal funds presently serve cities better than they do suburbs. Although incomplete, there ex-

22

ists evidence to the effect that federal funds reach suburban students in greater proportion than they do city students.

A much discussed prospect for federal assistance to city schools rests in the proposed scheme for revenue sharing. The bill submitted by the Nixon Administration contains a so-called "pass through" provision which would earmark a percentage of the total allocation for use by cities. Such a provision would avoid the tendency of state legislatures to slight urban areas. A difficulty with the Nixon measure is that it simply proposes to share too little money. If the President's bill were enacted, an unlikely event in itself, it would provide only an estimated $500 million in the first year, gradually escalating by 1975 to an amount equal to one percent of the income generated by the federal income tax (an estimated $2 billion). It must be remembered that this entire amount is for all public services, not for schools exclusively. Thus, the hope of cities finding relief from their fiscal problems through federal action is slight indeed.

"Metropolitanism" has been advocated by some as a solution to the tension between city school problems and state-level inertia.[6] The central idea here is that joint action by city and suburbs has been helpful in addressing urban ills in such areas as transportation, sanitation, and pollution. Why not try it for education? What this proposed solution lacks by way of practical substance it compensates for in terms of political naiveté. To begin with, the basic theme is that an enlarged geographic unit will assist in redressing urban tax base and service disparities. If this is so, then why not move to an even larger geographic base, and one which has the appropriate legal authority in the first place—the state? Proponents of the metropolitan solution make a grave error in equating schools with sewage or pollution. There are a number of clear-cut and highly visible advantages in cooperating on dimensions such as these, and willingness to put aside community identity and political differences shows itself rather readily. However, the benefits from metropolitan area school cooperation are not so evident, and anyone who does not realize the reluctance of citizens to give up their "local control" should examine the history of school district consolidation in the U.S.[7]

If not a federal or metropolitan solution, then what? As hinted at earlier, it may be that state legislatures themselves will come to see the folly inherent in their past shortchanging of cities. Such enlightenment is not likely to come about as a consequence of some miraculous value transformation or attack of altruism on the part of those in power. Rather, if it occurs, it may be a product of the same social and economic forces which previously brought misery to the cities.

In addition to revealing the gross statistic that suburban residents now outnumber their central city neighbors, the 1970 census data also disclose that the suburbs no longer can be considered as a homogeneous band of wealthy and white bedroom communities. The term "suburb" must now be viewed as including a much more heterogeneous cluster of municipalities, a growing number of which are composed of low income and minority group individuals. What this means is that despite the many barriers that were erected, the troubles of the city ghettos are beginning to "leak" into the suburbs. The low performance, low motivation, racial conflict, and organizational malaise which characterize city schools are slowly beginning to be problems in suburban schools. To whatever degree and with whatever speed this transition occurs, urban school ills are likely to receive greater attention and assistance from state level authorities.

But What About Educators?

Up to this point, the picture of possible reforms is far from optimistic. From a time when they were once preeminent, city school systems have sunk to their present sorry state, in which vast numbers of their clients seek schooling elsewhere. This decline in quality has occurred at a time when the cities' own financial resources have not permitted them to solve the problems themselves. Moreover, they are denied the assistance they so badly need from the state level because they do not control the necessary political leverage. State governments have the legal authority and fiscal resources to rescue the cities, but they continue to favor rural and suburban areas.

There is some small reason to believe that the spread of poor and undereducated students to the suburbs may, in time, make state officials more sympathetic to urban problems. However, for the short run, this is but a faint hope. For somewhat different reasons, the prospects of federal government assistance and metropolitan cooperation appear to be no more hopeful. Where then can urban school systems turn? In short, where can city schools find political allies? What about educational organizations? The political power of teachers, administrators, and school board members is well known.[8] What is the record of these groups in coalescing behind the needs of city schools?

Unfortunately, our record as educators, administrators included, is not particularly admirable on this issue. Too frequently, the politics of educational interest groups are but a smaller reflection of the urban-nonurban tensions that characterize state-level politics. Educators have difficulty agreeing statewide on a system of priorities that places the needs of city schools at the top. Those who are most influential in educators' organizations are not totally unmindful of the difficulties besetting cities, but they tend to place the needs of their own suburban and rural districts first.

The persistent neglect of the social and educational needs of the lower class and racial and ethnic mi-

23

norities which populate our cities represents nothing less than the abandonment of America's long held and loudly proclaimed belief in equality of opportunity. One would hope that school administrators, at least, once realizing this, would solidify their ranks and begin to deploy their considerable political voice in an effort to gain for city schools the attention of state governments which they so desperately need.

Footnotes

1. A part of the same process resulted in "fiscal dependence" (upon the overall municipal government) for a number of city school districts. Conventional educational wisdom proclaims this governmental arrangement to be unfair and discriminatory, because having to obtain finances through another legislative body (typically the city council and mayor) reduces the school allotment from what it would be if the board of education itself were the only body having to pass on the budget. However, such wisdom does not stand up to empirical test. Whatever differences occur in the expenditure levels of fiscally "independent" and "dependent" school districts can be accounted for more easily by factors associated with wealth and demand than by variations in governmental structure. For added discussion of this point see James, H. T.; Kelly, James A.; and Garms, Walter I. *Determinants of Educational Expenditures in Large Cities of the United States*. USOE Cooperative Research Contract No. 2389. (Stanford: Stanford University School of Education, 1966. pp. 95-156. See also James, H. T., *et al. Wealth, Expenditures, and Decision-Making for Education*. USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 1241. Stanford: Stanford University School of Education, 1963.

2. *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), and *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, 387 U.S. 1 (1964).

3. Even when such adjustments are made for the added problems of the cities, legislatures frequently neglect to fund the provisions in an amount which permits any difference in the quality of the educational services offered by cities.

4. See Jackson, Penrose B., *Trends in Elementary and Secondary Education Expenditures: Central City and Suburban Comparisons, 1965 to 1968*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1969. (Mimeo.)

5. See Guthrie, James W., and Lawton, Stephen B., "The Distribution of School Aid Funds: Who Wins? Who Loses?" *Educational Administration Quarterly* 6:47-61; Winter 1970.

6. See, for example, Bendiner, Robert. *The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self-Government*. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

7. For an added analysis of the drawbacks to metropolitanism for schools see Levin, Henry M., "Why Metropolitan School Districts?" an address delivered at a UCEA Career Development Seminar, Buffalo, New York, November 1969. (Mimeo.)

8. See, for example, Bailey, Stephen M., *et al. Schoolmen and Politics*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Public education cannot be easily budged from its historical conviction that it is not like other human enterprises. Educational literature, for the most part, has reinforced this posture by proclaiming that school systems are privileged sanctuaries which are above the meanness of everyday politics. In consequence, we educators have resisted rather well suggestions from the citizenry demanding more efficiency and clearer identification of the obsolete and unnecessary. The strength of such commitment has some justification. Few of us relish returning to the inhumaneness and rigidity of the Taylor-induced scientific management craze in American public education.

Number Six

Much data about the complexity of school administration, of course, is unknown to outsiders. They know nothing of the debilitating and endless pressures involved in making day-to-day operational decisions. They do not understand why we lack the financial resources needed to meet our considerable responsibilities. They question our capacity as educational leaders, but they have no viable solutions to many of the problems they rail against.

Spurred on by the feeling of futility and helplessness of the deprived groups in our society, concepts like relevance, accountability, community control, and the like are challenging the legitimacy of our present school system. Critics are pointing out that education is political, and that schools are political organizations with all the status and power hangups that such a definition implies. Finally, the most damning allegation is that schooling as a social system serves political ends. The question remains: why have we reached this dangerous impasse? The reason is not hard to find.

In theory, public schools should be equal in every way, but this is not the case. School systems inevitably mirror the financial resources and social values of their supporting communities. The presence or absence at the community level of sufficient intellectual and financial resources is the most decisive factor in determining the overall quality of a school system; in other words, a community gets what it pays for in the way of a school system.

Such disparity is consistently found from state to state in spite of significant regional differences in social structure, culture, and laws. Parents and students are becoming more acutely aware of these inequities, and they are attempting to redress their grievances by active political intervention. To date, school systems have generally been able to maintain their present structures inviolate. The status quo has been preserved because school systems are essentially political subdivisions of local governments and thereby necessarily reflect the expectations of their governing elites. In short, public schools operate within the framework of those sources of power or symbols of legitimacy impinging upon a particular community.

Research studies have verified that several different typologies of community-influence systems do exist, and they indicate that communities may often be characterized as in transition from one type of structure to another.[1] Power, of course, is elusive and difficult to describe and verify empirically.

For instance, very few comparative studies involving community power structures have been conducted, no doubt because of the unusually difficult methodological and logistical problems involved; it is easier to conduct an intensive case

---

Donald McCarty, dean, College of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, prepared this article, "Community Influence Systems and Local Educational Policy Making," for *The School Administrator*. **It is the sixth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."**

study in which startling descriptive and often entertaining data may be imaginatively analyzed. Small wonder that researchers in this field spend a great deal of time criticizing each other's methods and findings.

Types of Communities

Fortunately, communities and their decision-making centers can be systematically categorized along a continuum. Sociological literature is partial to a type of power structure called the elite power model. This concept holds that the power structure in a community is pyramidal, with a few men or even one man at the top. The decisive decision-making group is likely to be the economic elite of the community, although dominance may also derive from religion, ethnicity, political party, race, or whatever. This phenomenon is often referred to as the conspiracy theory of politics.

The point to remember is that the elite power model does not allow for conflict between sides of relatively even strength. If the elite group desires to exercise power in a particular instance its control becomes absolute. For example, the owners of the major industry in a company town are not too likely to have their dominance threatened; if their decision-making power is being challenged effectively, by definition, the community is no longer dominated by a single elite.

There are some communities in which at least two durable factions compete for control over important decisions. In these situations are found not only relatively even sides but also clear manifestations of power within each faction similar to those in the single elite power model. These factions tend to coalesce around natural rallying points such as religion, politics, occupation (as in town versus gown), and economic philosophy.

Some communities follow neither the elite nor the factional power model. Rather, the power structure is pluralistic, or diffused, with many poles of power. Theoretically, there is no single power structure which must be reckoned with in any situation. Leadership varies with issues. Power and community interests exist, but power is contestable and not overwhelming.

A fourth type of power structure is frequently seen in small rural communities. This residual type of community reveals no active power structure. Power is basically inert or, more properly, latent, and resembles a sort of domination by the status quo. In such an environment, radical experimentation is not likely to occur.

Walton,[2] after reviewing a number of research studies in the community power field, identified four similar typologies. He concluded that the most common types were—

1. Pyramidal (a monolithic, monopolistic, or single cohesive leadership group)
2. Factional (at least two durable factions that compete for advantage)
3. Coalitional (leadership varies with issues and is made up of fluid coalitions of interested persons and groups)
4. Amorphous (the absence of any persistent pattern of leadership or power exercised on the local level).

In sum, communities are not idiosyncratic at all but instead fall into readily identifiable patterns. Communities are, however, dynamic; as environmental conditions change, decision-making structures will eventually respond to these demands, perhaps too slowly for many of their constituents. This fact accounts for much of the community conflict we frequently observe.

Public school systems, subject as they are to community political environments, are geared to local political demands. If and when such external forces wish to modify course content, the framing and execution of long-range plans, and the like, they must attempt to influence the school board and the superintendent of schools either directly or indirectly. As one might expect, overt demonstrations of power influence are rare. More sophisticated techniques in opinion management are usually employed.

School Boards

Boards of education and superintendents do exhibit a type of decision-making structure that corresponds to the particular kind of community power structure manifested. The elite power structure results in a dominated board of education. Board members are chosen on the assumption that they will take the advice of community leaders mainly because they share the ideology of the dominant group. The powerful figures on the board tend to be reelected time and again. In such a situation a board majority, or perhaps one or two powerful individuals, represent the community elite and exercise power so that policy follows the right direction. The board tends to vote unanimously on all basic issues. Members of such a board are not necessarily consciously aware of the impact of homogeneity on board decision-making. By definition, there is no organized opposition of any magnitude contesting for office.

In the community with a factional power structure a factional school board is found. Voting is more important than discussion in board meetings; if the vote is crucial, the majority faction always wins. Board members represent the viewpoint of one or the other of the factions and tend to act according to the ideology of the group they represent. Members of any one group tend to consider other groups as motivated by specific group interests. Board elections are hotly contested. One particular faction may be in control of the board at any one time, but the balance is likely to shift as new members are selected.

In the community with a pluralistic power structure school board members may often represent particular interests, but there is no over-

26

all theme of power influence. Therefore, in this type of community school board members are active but not rigidly bound to one position. Discussion, often before a motion, is of utmost importance. Board members are equal in status and treat each other as colleagues free to act as individuals. Rather than a hierarchy of control within the board, there exists a community of peers whose decisions are characterized by full discussion of problems and arrival at consensus in an atmosphere of detachment from the interests of any particular segment of the community. Members do not tend to promote the interests of specific community groups.

In the community with the inert power structure the school board is inactive and has no philosophical reinforcement from the community. It tends to perform perfunctorily because board members neither represent nor receive reinforcement from citizens for expressing one viewpoint or another. When decisions have to be made, the board tends to follow the lead of the professional staff without going extensively into the appropriateness of a policy in terms of community needs or desires. It simply sanctions policies presented to it and does little but exercise its right to approve or reject proposals from the administration. Board members show a high degree of respect for the administrator and look to him for advice in most matters.

School Superintendents

Is the school superintendent able to perform his role independently or is he influenced by the environmental strictures outlined? As in the old and unsettled argument about the primacy of environment or heredity in determining intelligence, there is much to be said for environmental pressures' overcoming the psychological and professional preferences of an administrator. By their very nature school systems are political institutions, and it is not unreasonable to expect a superintendent of schools to reconcile himself to the realities of political life. This is what ordinarily happens.

In the dominated community and board the superintendent must play the role of functionary if he is to act effectively as the integrator of community interests and school programs. He tends to identify with the dominant interests and takes his cues for action from them. Needless to say, he may do this as a matter of conscience, since he is probably in complete agreement with proposals offered by the elitist group. He perceives himself as an administrator who carries out policy rather than as a developer of policy; hence he asks the board for detailed plans of any action to be taken. The school board, either unconsciously or deliberately, will choose a superintendent who holds beliefs and follows behavior patterns consistent with prevailing themes in the dominated community. So long as this person agrees with the dominant ideology, all necessary business will continue to be done in his office but he will not be a true decision maker.

In the factional community and board the superintendent must work with the majority, but since these communities often change majorities, he must be careful not to become identified too closely with one faction. In other words, he must be a political strategist. He takes his direction from the faction exercising power at any particular time, but he behaves in such a way that he can also work effectively with the opposing group when the power balance shifts. He does not recommend one course of action as the best, to the exclusion of all others; rather than taking a strong stand on controversial issues, he follows a middle course, allowing himself room for retreat. He is not an active supporter of any particular group in the board.

In the community with a pluralistic power structure and status-congruent board, the superintendent is expected to give professional advice, based on the best educational research and theory. The board is active but open-minded. The superintendent is not limited to carrying out policy handed down to him, nor is he forced to shape his opinions according to the ideology of the group in power. His approach can be more statesmanlike in the sense that he can express to the board alternatives to any policy and can delineate the consequences of any action openly and objectively. He frequently presents proposals for experimental programs and acts primarily as a change agent.

In the community with the inert power structure and the sanctioning board the superintendent initiates action and the board becomes merely a rubber stamp. In this case the role of the superintendent is that of decision maker. He does not have to take cues from any dominant group, nor is he called on to give technical advice as a basis for decision. Because of the lack of interest on the part of the board, the superintendent not only is free to initiate action but must do so if the program is to be effective. His support is a *sine qua non* for the success of any recommendation made by individual board members.

The preceding descriptive account of community power structure and school administration may be summarized as follows:

Community Power Structure	School Board	Role of the Superintendent
Dominated	Dominated	Functionary
Factional	Factional	Political strategist
Pluralistic	Status congruent	Professional adviser
Inert	Sanctioning	Decision maker

These categorizations are ideal types, gross characterizations rather than sharply honed discriminations. Yet, a comprehensive field investigation of this conceptual model resulted in statistically significant confirmation of these important relationships. The most powerful dimension underlying this discussion is the proposition that a school administrator who is out of touch with the political dynamics of his supporting environment will likely be neutralized

in one form or another. Frequently the result is involuntary resignation, early retirement, job transfer, or, sometimes, public firing. Moreover, our highly mobile society with its rapid economic movements often brings about radical restructuring of established communities. If the incumbent school administrator in such a place is unable to adjust his leadership style to the new demands, he, too, becomes expendable.

It is impossible to predict with certainty what will happen when community, school board, and superintendent are out of step with each other. Generally, the aggregate influence of a community power structure on a school board and its superintendent is relatively low. This power is also diluted by both state and federal laws. Unless the schism becomes bitter, natural inertia may intervene and the superintendent may retain his position although his leadership is effectively rejected. Furthermore, a superintendent of surpassing ability may be so visibly competent that he cannot easily be dislodged.

Although this analysis seems to account for most common occurrences, community power structures are by definition almost impossible to classify in rigid categories. Communities are constantly changing; what may be accurate enough at this time may be quite inaccurate in the not-too-distant future. Still, with all these reservations, it seems reasonably certain that if a superintendent of schools is employed in a community where his particular administrative approach does not fit the role expectations, and he is unable or does not wish to adjust his behavior, this incongruity will result in community conflict.

Unfortunately the great mass of the public is oriented toward nonparticipation in community affairs and, unless motivated by a controversial issue, tends to evince apathy, boredom, and escapism. The future demands on the educational enterprise are so awesome in character that they will require massive structural changes at every governmental level. The citizenry as a whole must become active participants in reordering educational goals and priorities.

Many familiar educational shibboleths such as strict age placement, competitive grades, the single teacher isolated with a given set of learners, and a standard curriculum for all, are under heavy attack. The interested citizen should be raising hard substantive questions about these issues locally while encouraging his school board and superintendent to experiment; otherwise, by default, power seekers will rush in to fill the vacuum.

Finally, the rapid escalation of federal and state financial assistance to local school systems invites an entirely new control structure from the one that presently exists. Many states are already paying a substantial share of the local school system budget; the federal government appears likely to increase its contribution. Ultimately, the really crucial decisions about education may emanate from state capitals and from Washington.

For the foreseeable future, however, local community control will remain a powerful force. Community power structures have been resilient enough to ward off the effects of most externally-imposed strictures on their freedoms, by such Machiavellian mechanisms as failing to comply in toto with the regulations promulgated, refusing help outright, interpreting statutes to fit local preferences, using delaying tactics, and the like. It is clear that as long as the property tax remains as an important revenue producer, local power structures will continue to exert significant power over educational policy in the schools. Curiously enough, while it has been popular to predict its early demise as natural and inevitable, local community control of the public schools remains a vibrant reality; it is far from becoming a myth.

FOOTNOTES

1. See McCarty, Donald J., and Ramsey, Charles E., *The School Managers: Power and Conflict in American Public Education* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, forthcoming) for a detailed comparative account of the effects of community power structures on boards of education and school administrators in 51 different communities.

2. Walton, John. "Discipline, Method and Community Power: A Note on the Sociology of Knowledge." *American Sociological Review* 3: 684-89; October 1966.

3. McCarty and Ramsey, *op. cit.*

28

Number Seven

On my way to the schoolhouse I met an elephant and a donkey. This is a daily occurrence. The history of public education in the United States is a history of political confrontation and involvement. It would appear that such confrontation and involvement will characterize the future as well. The number of citizens and school people who believe that education can be separated neatly and completely from the political life of the community, state, and nation is decreasing.

The initiation of public schools was not an act of setting them to one side away from the main stream of political reality. Instead, they were actually so placed that they would confront the elephant and the donkey. The Massachusetts General Assembly, back in 1647, required each town with 50 or more householders to establish an elementary school at community expense. Thus was born the school system that eventually spread throughout the country.[1] In the beginning, a general assembly acted, and the phrase "community expense" meant financing by some form of taxation. When years later the founding fathers once again acted politically and established the United States Constitution, they waived the opportunity to set up a national system and instead established education as a responsibility of each state. Most state constitutions contain some declaration of guaranteeing the people an efficient system of free public schools. The states in turn have assigned much of the responsibility to the local level. Their legislatures in one way or another have created local school districts, local boards of education to run them, state boards of education, and state departments of education to carry out state board policies. So on our way to a discussion of politics in education, we must face the fact that education is woven into many aspects of government at all levels. This is where the money is, this is where the action is, and no amount of debate will make it go away. We must decide whether the meeting on the way to the schoolhouse will be a simple maneuvering for the most advantageous position or whether it will be genuine head knocking—gutter politics of the most objectionable kind.

Knowing that we must confront the politician, the decision as to techniques and tactics should be based on a careful reading of the political atmosphere in the arena where the action is about to take place. Who is for and who is against? Who is on the fence and can be convinced? Is the opposition rabidly radical or is it in a sound position with far too many facts in its favor? Where are the power blocks? Who is an influential dominating personality? There are literally limitless questions that could be asked that would furnish significant data upon which to build an effective political confrontation.

The phrase "political confrontation" carries with it the meaning of face-to-face debate. It implies a purposeful argumentation of a diplomatic nature. Some might add the ingredient of hostility, although this might or might not be included in the definition. For the purpose of this discussion, all-inclusiveness is the criterion of the definition. If "political confrontation" is narrowly defined, we shall miss some of the effectiveness of the manner in which achievements are accomplished in our society. Then too, there is the danger of our being excused by a narrow definition because it allows us to classify ourselves as either in or out of the political framework. For example, the small system superintendent might refrain from involvement because "political confrontation is a procedure for the urbanite."

E. C. Stimbert, state commissioner of education, Nashville, Tennessee, prepared this article, "Political Confrontation," for *The School Administrator*. It is the seventh in a series of 12 essays on the general subject "Politics and Education."

Administrators in simple political structures would use the same excuse for noninvolvement.

There is no excuse for noninvolvement. The small community has its political power structure, though it may be a more simple one. As much influence may be wielded by a certain individual in a rural neighborhood as by the big city political machine boss. In some situations the opinion, influence, and approval of the biggest land holder in the rural neighborhood must first be obtained or the educational objective is completely dead from the very beginning. Get it and you are on your way. On the other hand, the same situation can be found in a much larger, more complex governmental structure. Many of our large cities have several pages in their history telling us of periods of time when it was absolutely mandatory to get the blessing of the "boss" before the school budget could be presented, salaries increased, a building built, or a policy passed.

Realistically, whether there is a dominating political personality or not, procedures for operating a school system have as a basic ingredient political know-how, or "savvy." The big problem, it would seem, is not how we keep school administration out of politics but how we conduct ourselves in the political arena in such a manner that the charge of doing it loses some of its sting in the light of accomplishment. This requires astuteness and the application of managerial techniques that demonstrate a high level of understanding of the maneuverability of people. It may be as simple as knowing when to turn on the understandings, psychological and otherwise, that prove that people can work together for common causes. It may be knowing when to be adamant even to the point of abrasiveness. It is doubtful that political confrontation can be divorced from personalities and from what is generally known about how personalities can be directed if the goal is to obtain positive, affirmative votes on school issues.

Perhaps the most urgent problem facing administrators is an internal one. The administrator has the responsibility of dealing with other members of the teaching profession. What is done and how it is done spells the difference between a satisfactory relationship and a confrontation than can end in constant conflict among the various segments of employees serving a community. There is merit in the package of techniques that falls under the heading of structured participation in collaborative decision making. Teacher participation with administrators in the operation of a school system can do much to diminish the loss of time and energy that occurs when the relationship is based on the conflict of bargaining or negotiations. Leadership can be exercised to bring about an atmosphere of professionalism and cohesion within the profession. This is basic because if the cohesion is lacking, then punch or clout is lacking. The opposition is always delighted when it can observe a broken front instead of a solid front. At no point in relationships are administrators so negligent, so slow, or even so obdurate as they are in this matter. They fail to realize that this is probably the first step to success in many other arenas of political confrontation. Mention any significant aspect of school system management and you will be mentioning an opportunity for a development of those teacher-administrator relationships that could mean the difference between success and failure.

If the school system is to operate, it must have funds to do so. If the system through its chief executive and the board is waging a running gun battle with its employees at budget time, it is obvious that the legally constituted body that approves budgets or furnishes funds cannot be effectively confronted. In fact, this may be one reason among many that achieving adequate budgets is so difficult, and it may have something to do with the inability of the public or legally constituted approval bodies to grant authority for bond issues. Teacher militancy, coupled with administrative know-how and understanding, can become a dynamic force in achieving not only financial support but also moral support for schools. The faith of the public is lessened, if not shattered, when they must stand on the sidelines and see their children become the victims of internecine strife. Through continuous contacts, and by means of a well-designed public relations program which includes the community's politicians, it is possible to develop the school system's image to the point where the limits of financial support are set high by the community leaders. School bulletins, documents, and studies should flow to county court and city councilmen. Persons with other key titles should be on the mailing list. Frequent meetings for the dissemination of information should be deliberately scheduled well in advance of the actual confrontation or the presentation of a matter. Over and over again when this matter is discussed, community leaders point out that school people are most negligent in providing them with a continuous flow of the right kind of information.

There is a tendency to limit educational discussions to the dollar sign. Admittedly at the local, state, and federal levels, the pressure points must be understood and used, organizations must be rallied, influences must be utilized. At the state level, illustrations are legion of the accomplishments of the state associations of administrators and teachers combining to get needed funds. There is general familiarity with the most recent organizing for full funding at the federal level. Add to these better known attempts the further implications of this series. Each article is far too short to cover the subjects adequately, but hopefully each might stir up some thinking about a neglected topic. Other important educational matters are dependent on planning and timing.

One large urban system made a

30

logical decision to decentralize administratively. Realizing the opposition that might develop from different directions, the system devised a deliberate plan for involving the entire community in preparation for the acceptance of a radical departure from the past. For six months very minor changes were initiated—just sufficient to get the project operative. Literally hundreds of people participated in different kinds of meetings discussing the advantages and disadvantages of decentralization. On the other hand, another system of similar size stubbed its toe on the very first decision about decentralization, which dealt with area boundary lines of the subdistricts that were created. The difference between success and failure in the two districts might well be ascribed to the first one's using community political know-how to gain acceptance for that which the school board could have said it had a perfect right to order without the planning and timing. In the first district the timing and planning were as nearly perfect as school board administrators and study committees could make them. In the second district, power was wielded legitimately but did not take into account community politics.

It is just as important to spend time and effort in planning the campaign as in planning the project that the campaign is all about. To further illustrate this point, a school system can be cited that used a similar plan to obtain a higher level of acceptance of desegregation plans. Weary of the continued emphasis by the courts on ratios and percentages of pupils and teachers, this system set out to establish relationships that would be fundamental and lasting. Believing that the mere movement of bodies creates the least understanding, it set about developing activities in all phases of the school system and the community with due regard for the accepted principles of good planning and good timing. As a consequence, literally thousands of children and adults were taught to practice human relation skills and the art of appreciating the multicultural aspects of their community.

As various cities are studied from the standpoint of both failures and successes, it becomes clear that the future of public education rests to a great extent on how school boards, administrators, professional groups, and pressure groups wield their respective power.

The failures have been so numerous that they have been described as a crisis in self-government. As a formulator of the community's philosophy of education, the school board is usually so muted in tone and so vague in rhetoric that it rarely invites challenge (political confrontation). "What the philosophy usually boils down to is 'the best possible education for the boys and girls of this community for the most reasonable and efficient expenditure of the taxpayers' money.' " [2]

Why are we so hesitant about accepting the premise that political involvement is an absolute necessity? Public education in these times competes with a multitude of modern attractions, inventions, and institutions for the time, energies, attention, and money of the individual. Could it be that as school administrators we are out of touch and tune with the times? This does not seem possible; nevertheless, one observing organizational actions, conventions, and conferences might draw the conclusion that the number of leaders in education who have not yet been shocked into action is considerable. Little time is left for us to apply the pressures that will make this great American institution, the public school, a viable, dynamic, ever-changing, effective, essential element of our society. What is the matter with us? It is plain to see that time is short.

As change accelerates, what does the future hold? And what part *must* (not *will*) education play in preparing for and adjusting to the conditions? It is practically a matter of survival. The rate of social, cultural, and technological change extracts a human cost. ". . . when diversity . . . converges with transience and novelty, we rocket the society toward an historical crisis of adaptation. We create an environment so ephemeral, unfamiliar and complex as to threaten millions with adaptive breakdowns." [3] The acceleration of change and the announced attempts from many quarters to chip away constantly at the effectiveness of public education make it essential that the administrator, along with all other professionals and interested community leadership, be politically active and aggressive, if the support for education is going to be adequate for the types of programs, projects, and activities the 70's, 80's and 90's call for. If this support becomes inadequate, then the 90's will punningly become a type of sleeping garment for civilization to wear as it goes into its long, inevitable, eternal sleep.[4] If change has accelerated, and there is no successful argument that it has not, then the understanding of change must be accelerated at an even greater rate so that we can be ahead in our planning for successfully managing the changes.

The discussion leader on urban policy and development was probably right, but the same statement could be made about the policy-makers in education. Neither have we created a solid front of attack for the solution of our problems.

Parenthetically we should concern ourselves also with the fact that the critics of education do not have the solutions but sometimes their suggestions have tremendous political undercurrents. Voucher plans, performance contracting, bypassing of state and local boards, and a host of other so-called innovations are frequently initiated subtly to make the school system less effective and to prove that it has done a poor job.

Congressmen can read and congressmen can pass laws, guidelines can be written, and when it's all over, we find that the school system has had its reputation blackened just

31

a bit, but it is still required to operate for fewer dollars per pupil than the grandiose experiment used.

The largest file in any superintendent's office should be his letters of communication with his Congressmen. It is a good thing that the institution of public education is so deeply imbedded in our thinking; otherwise, it would have disappeared in the last couple of decades just because of the manner in which it has been treated by its critics. The point should not be misunderstood. Criticism, particularly the constructive kind, is an absolute essential. Disagreement is good, but the church should not be bombed in order to replace the bells in the belfry.[5]

At the Urban Policy Conference the topic for the day's discussion was the question of priorities. What is it we really want in America, and what are we doing to each other in the process of getting it? Maybe in an age that is making such tremendous technological changes at such an accelerating rate, we, as educational politicians, ought to be knowledgeable about the changing pattern of attitudes if we are to be effective.

Neighborhoods are unstable. Millions of people change their residential address each year. In one school system with approximately 150,000 pupils there are over 6,000 address changes every twenty days. Community, with its capital "C," is a surface kind of organization and does not run too deep. The school administrator is not dealing with a simple political entity as the superintendent of schools did some fifty years ago. Politics moves to the larger stage. We compete with the interstate highway and not the dirt country road whose ruts were smoothed by the drag drawn by the four-horse team. The scene is filled with blurs as these interstates are traversed by a nation spinning its wheels at 75 per. The air is filled with people traveling in one hour the distance the people on the ground travel in a day.

Should the educational leader in a scene like this keep plodding his weary way just meeting the elephant and the donkey? We are on the brink of observing that even political knowledgeability and political techniques may be too slow. Many are calling our present changes a revolution of sorts. If this be so, then what further demands are made upon leadership to understand and to help mold and fashion support of a structure that is Establishment and System, acceptable and necessary to the nation? Our responsibilities are frightening. There are many who believe that there is no answer for the directions we might go in the next 30 years, other than those to be found in education.

We face enormously complex issues, problems, and opportunities, and we will have to use unprecedentedly powerful means to respond to them. I contend that one of those extremely powerful means is found in the political component of our society. The word "political" must be defined as all planning and policy making in addition to the usual simple concept of electing officials. This extremely broad definition, which we must use if we are going to make our confrontations realistic and effective, means "beefing up" the public relations and personnel relations programs. It means really becoming involved as organizational arrangements through which decisions are made and policies are carried out become even more interlocked. "Leaders will continue to be too rigid, too defensive, too remote from themselves and thereby from others to have the flexible and bold state of mind that will be needed to cope humanely and imaginatively with plans and turmoil, order and disorder. It will take special efforts indeed to enlarge the emotional underpinning of those who recruit themselves to use the social technologies needed to run a complex society."[6]

Dynamic, constructive administrative militancy is called for by these times and conditions. The concluding paragraph in Robert Bendiner's book *The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self-Government* gives us a closing thought on the urgency of the business at hand. Speaking of those who will play an active part, the writer says, "They will possibly have saved the city—and the suburb and country with it. For the truth is that we have come to a point in our affairs when the political entity of the city no longer coincides with the overriding social facts of where people work and live. And when that happens, government must gradually lose its grip and in time cease to govern. Looking at our worn and seething centers of frustration, no one can doubt that we have already moved into this downward spiral, that the saving of our school boards, even the saving of our schools, is only an aspect of the larger and more desperate need to save our cities. In saving our cities, we possibly can save the nation."[7] Let's get on with our confrontation.

Footnotes

1. "The State's Role in Public Education," School Board Briefing Paper, *Croft Educational Service*, August 1970.
2. Bendiner, Robert. *The Politics of Schools*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. pp. 3-4
3. Article written for *Psychology Today* magazine, based on *Future Shock*, a new book by Alvin Toffler (New York: Random House, 1970).
4. Pardon the pun.
5. Apology number 2—At least the baby wasn't thrown out with the bath.
6. Michael, Donald N. *The Unprepared Society: Planning for a Precarious Future*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. p. 111.
7. Bendiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-27.

Number Eight

Planning enables educators to consider what is desirable, while politics determines what is feasible. Broadly speaking, *planning* is simply the orderly application of intelligence to problems of continuity and change. *Politics* is the study of "who gets what, when, how." At a time when interest in educational planning models is increasing, the public schools are in a state of unprecedented disarray, and it is apparent that better planning procedures are urgently needed to bring about structural reforms. The prescription that most of our lay experts offer is to throw away the present molds and develop new ones. However, there is an institutional tendency for schools publicly to support planning efforts (professed values) but privately to resist operational changes (observed values) that the planning process may specify as necessary. Educators are very open-minded about new ideas so long as they are exactly like the old ones. In effect, planning models in education encounter very real political barriers that dispel any romanticized notions about basic change that the planner once may have held. The basic purpose of this article is to identify the uses and abuses of planning within the political environment of public schools. The article is organized around three major themes: (1) observations about the current environment of educational planning, (2) identification of possible limitations confronting planning models, and (3) consideration of potential misuses and abuses of new approaches.

I. SCHOOL PLANNING ENVIRONMENT: IMPRESSIONISTIC OBSERVATIONS

Other articles in this AASA series have described the changing relationships between public education and the diverse political arenas within which the schools operate. My concern is with the political factors that influence and restrict the use of planning models. Described below are several impressionistic and arbitrary observations about the setting in which educational planning must match expectations with achievements.

Emergent Political Forces Oppose Rational Planning

The decade of the 1970's is propagating a youth culture that opposes technology as an end and distrusts rational planning methods. The political implications of this apparent rebirth of human values are substantial. In the 1960's, our prime values were meritocracy, science, technology, and institutional planning. The organization was accused of taking precedence over the individual. Now young people are bringing about a type of transcendent revolution that will cause planners to justify their analytical tools in terms of existential values. In *The Greening of America*, Charles Reich analyzed American history in terms of three distinct eras: Consciousness I (the American frontier spirit); Consciousness II (the "corporate state" with its organization values and rational planning); and Consciousness III (the emerging youth culture). School administrators clearly fall within the Consciousness II category.

Although I personally do not share Reich's distrust of reason as portrayed in Consciousness III, I believe that his observations about the changing political environment do reflect the beliefs of many who will soon hold major policy-making positions. The burden is upon us who believe in rational planning to demonstrate that technology can truly enhance humanistic values.

Harry J. Hartley, associate dean, School of Education, New York University, New York City, prepared this article, "Planning and Politics," for *The School Administrator*. It is the eighth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."

Schools Are Becoming More Bureaucratized

Organizational theorists have put forth conceptual models of formal organizations, but all of these are variations of a basic theme. That theme is *bureaucracy*. Max Weber identified the basic characteristics of a bureaucracy (rules, hierarchy, expertise, etc.), and Presthus, Blau, Simons and other social scientists have examined contemporary human groups from the same perspective. As schools have grown in size and complexity, they have acquired an even greater degree of bureaucratization. Since the planning process is designed to bring about *change*, opposition is created by those who favor the status quo. The result is an organizational tendency to support planning efforts but to minimize the chances for any implementation. Such resistance to planned change increases with the growth in complexity and size of the bureaucracy.

Educators Prefer Incremental Change

The dominant pattern of planning and decision making in education is by incremental change. Few decisions are reached by rigorous use of cost-effectiveness analysis of alternatives. This is particularly true in the case of budget formation. Next year's school budget will have the same function-object categories as this year's. It will simply involve projections of perhaps 15 percent increases in each category, but with little attempt to assess the worth of each competing program. School planning at present is a tradition-bound, low risk, minimal feedback, slow sequence of incremental changes that makes occasional spurts when a crisis arises. It is the result of myopic vision.

II. POSSIBLE LIMITATIONS AFFECTING PLANNING MODELS

Let us turn now to some of the operational difficulties of planning in education. Most of the literature describing the new generation of management procedures is rather long on persuasion and short on critical appraisal. My own attitude is one of two-and-a-half cheers for systems analysis. The reasons for refraining from that last half cheer are outlined in the 9 limitations below. This focus on constraints, offered by one who is an enthusiastic supporter of systematic planning, should not be interpreted as a rejection of the approach. Rather, it calls for a more realistic, experience-based application of systems analysis in schools.

Intangibility of Educational Goals

In education, as in most organizations, one should speak about a matrix of purposes, because members try to achieve diverse goals and satisfy multiple interests. Vagueness and diffuseness characterize the multipurpose goals of the schools. Many of the goals are intangible, which creates problems for the planner-analyst. In a decentralized, open system such as a local school, objectives are often matters of rigorous public debate. There is remarkably little unanimity regarding explicit objectives and effective ways to attain and measure them. Presently, systems procedures and available mathematical instruments are appreciably more elaborate than educational measurement criteria.

Undermanagement with Inadequate Staffs

Some of our crusading lay experts today criticize schools and government in general for being overmanaged and top-heavy with administrators. My impression is just the opposite. I think that the real threat to schools, and even to democracy, comes not from overmanagement, but from undermanagement. When one considers the size, complexity, and diverse public expectations of local schools, it is amazing that we perform as well as we do. Local schools simply have inadequate staffs for rigorous planning. Deficiences exist in the training program of school administrators, the usage and number of administrative personnel, and the application of electronic data processing. We are plagued by "people problems."

Turnover Rate of Superintendents

Planning is a highly personalized process. New models are introduced by specific individuals who adapt them to their own leadership styles. When these individuals leave their organizations, the innovations suddenly come to a halt. As the turnover rate of chief school officers continues to increase, the problems of continuity of an innovation will persist. PPBS is a case in point. In many of those districts where a superintendent began to install PPBS and then departed for another position, the successor did not know how to proceed with the new procedures.

Shortcomings for Political Purposes

The school superintendent may be viewed as both analyst and politician, among other roles. As politician, he may find analytical planning tools both incomplete and frustrating. Analysis deals in a rather abstract way with scarce resource usage and efficient allocation decisions. It does *not* deal with the attitudinal issues of support-generation, coalition-gathering, or timing, which are so crucial in the political context.

Prohibitive Cost of Staff Involvement

Considering the current status of collective negotiations in education, many schools simply cannot afford to pay for participatory planning. In numerous cases, the formally negotiated contract specifies that teachers must be paid time-and-a-half (or some other high rate) for any additional professional work such as planning. The result is that these school districts must either pay for released time, or pay for extra

time for existing staff, or decide not to involve the full staff in planning. The dilemma of how to involve the teaching staff in planning is going to be even more severe for administrators during the mid-1970's. Planning will become more expensive in terms of time, talent, and money.

Adversarial Relationships in Negotiations

Many have observed that in the present environment of collective negotiations, teachers and administrators view each other as adversaries. This type of climate, which usually persists even after the annual negotiations are concluded, is not conducive to cooperative planning. When a new planning model is proposed by district officials, it may be met with skepticism or resistance by the teaching staff. Teachers may perceive that the central office has "something up its sleeve" when the new procedures are proposed. This mutual distrust is a very serious limitation to planning.

Opposition to Innovation

New planning procedures encounter opposition from educators who view modes of analysis as an encroachment upon their professional activities. Opposition of some degree to any form of planned change exists in education. In the case of systems analysis, some conscientious teachers may resist the new procedures, not because they are stubborn, but because their pride causes them to be fearful of failing at something new.

Teacher Ineffectiveness

Some professional educators are neither competent nor motivated to do an effective job. Traditionally, education has attracted mediocre students in colleges, often of provincial, lower middle class outlook, a large proportion of whom are women marking time before getting married. In many districts, teachers have become "infantilized," or treated like children: they must punch time clocks, file affidavits when sick, abide by dress codes, etc. Because we lack performance indicators, accountability is a problem. The problem is compounded because there is no codified body of knowledge that educators can learn and apply. As a profession, we even lack a useful set of empirically validated principles of instruction that could form the primitives of a theory of teaching. This limits the utility of planning models.

Intrinsic Ambivalence in Technology

New advances in computerized planning have resulted in charges that modern man is depersonalizing and alienating himself. For many, the computer has become the primordial symbol of mass impersonalization. This seems ironic because the computer has eliminated so much mental and manual drudgery. Nonetheless, man has consistently trembled a bit before his tools, and there always has been an intrinsic ambivalance in technology. Educators, too, are creating the "two cultures" that C.P. Snow has depicted.

III. POTENTIAL MISUSES AND ABUSES OF PLANNING MODELS

It is easy to exaggerate the extent to which technology can assist educators. Clearly, the new planning procedures can be misused. The intent of this section is to identify examples of misuses and abuses of the planning tools of management.

Gresham's Law of Planning

There is a tendency for people in organizations to engage only in activities related to goals that are clearly defined and sanctioned. The result is *goal displacement*, in which intangible goals are replaced by more tangible goals that are easier to live with and achieve. In what may be termed "Gresham's Law of Planning," programed activities tend to drive out unprogramed activities. Tangible educational goals replace intangible goals. To illustrate, the schools place a great emphasis on those goals that are most easily measured (cognitive aspects) and tend to neglect more important goals (moral perspectives) that cannot be tested and quantified.

Paralysis by Analysis

With the introduction of analytical models into organizations, there is a tendency to overformalize, overritualize, and overdocument. This proliferation of unnecessary procedures results in the familiar bureaucratic red tape. When analysis is used to extremes, it means that before a decision about a particular school problem can be made, (a) new committees must be formed, (b) outside consultants must be hired, (c) extensive reports must be circulated, and (d) administrators must attend special night meetings. The result is that analysis itself prevents officials from making decisions in a reasonable manner. This is "paralysis by analysis."

Jargon Faddism and Instant Experts

It is frightening to visit local districts that no longer have teachers, but now have inputs; where children have been replaced by outputs; where the curricular programs have become throughputs, and so forth. The surest way to sabotage an innovation like systems analysis is to adopt it in name only. In an age of student rebellion, students should not be casually labeled as outputs. The successful application of new planning models calls for much more than the flippant use of new jargon. In fact, the new terminology should be minimized during inservice training sessions with the staff. PPBS might be referred to simply as program planning; MIS could be called desired information; and PERT might be termed the scheduling of activities.

Overblown Affinity for Numbers

To adopt the view of some operations researchers, "If you can't count it, it doesn't count," is a serious

misuse of models in education. It places great emphasis on quantitative analysis without providing tools for qualitative analysis. In education, the things that are countable are few and often only vaguely related to the expressed end purposes of the schools. Educational planners may be prone to take statistics too literally, ignore their limitations, overemphasize the easily measured, and confuse partial truths with the whole truth about complex issues.

Bandwagon Approach to Innovation

In direct contrast to those who cherish the status quo are those who rush to jump on any bandwagon that carries educational innovations. But things that are *new* may not be *better*. The success of many proposed innovations has never really been measured. Most of the articles about innovations describe the potential value of a concept, but they do not validate it. What is needed is more critical, objective consideration of new procedures prior to their use. If innovations are evaluated in an organization by the same officials who originally introduced them, they are "doomed to success."

Instant Cost Reduction

Most planning models are neutral on the issue of cost reduction. If you are looking for ways of "stretching" school dollars, I warn that there is nothing inherent in a process such as program budgeting that enables it to avoid at least one pitfall of most current school budgets, which are "worse than the last, but not as bad as the next." In short, planning is *not* likely to reduce the total costs of a school district unless that district is willing to make the difficult decision to curtail programs and services. Many officials have introduced program budgeting into their districts as though it were a *mathematical Messiah* that would automatically reduce costs. Such is not the case.

Centralization Emphasis

At a time when schools are facing community demands for decentralization, some new planning models contain a centralizing bias. Decision making has become much more centralized within a tightly defined chain of command. The distance between the leader and the led is increasing, thus reducing the individual's democratic rights of decision, dissent and deviation. How to balance the advantages of efficiency obtained from centralized decision making against the human survival values of individual decision making at the "point of stress" is a basic problem of public school governance in our time.

Imitation of More Prestigious Organizations

Some of the planning models that are adopted by education are selected simply because industry or government popularized the same concepts. This imitation of "successful" organizations has resulted in problems of model adaptation. Unless analysts are sensitized to the dangers of casually applying corporation or defense models to education, the result is likely to be a misuse of the particular concept. Some people have even adopted the attitude that education has become too important an affair to be entrusted to educators. They think the schools should emulate industry, hire businessmen as superintendents, and increase productivity somehow.

Cult of Efficiency

Analytical planning may lead to the placing of too much emphasis on economic savings. When this occurs, preference is given to saving at the expense of accomplishing. If the only criterion used to make decisions is cost, then we will simply create another cult of efficiency. This is self-defeating. Knowing the costs of our goals should not mean that costs alone will dictate which goals to pursue.

Invasion of Individual Privacy

One of the most pernicious aspects of computer-based planning in education is the way it endangers individual privacy rights. Staff and students are often asked to provide information that might better remain confidential. This abuse could be avoided if schools would establish policies on information gathering and disclosure. Otherwise, computers could turn schools and society into a transparent world in which any indiscretion of an individual could be added to his dossier and reviewed by others many years later.

Conclusion

It is difficult to find fault with the systems viewpoint of modern planners, who agree in principle that it is preferable to examine problems or data in a whole context. There are exciting opportunities, accompanied by risks and dangers, in the application of modern decisional technologies to education. The new systems analysis mode of thinking is already exerting influence on political structure and style. PPBS-type arguments and justifications are being widely used by the new breed of *technipols* in political debates about education. These leaders employ rational argumentation to enhance their intuitive judgments. Although difficulties have arisen over the use of specific concepts, it should be pointed out that these planning models must make do in a world they did not create and have not yet fully mastered. In assessing the impact and success of planning in education, one should keep in mind that most projects have been characterized by incomplete implementation, institutional resistance, insufficient resources, and inadequately trained personnel. Bernard Shaw once observed that the only trouble with Christianity was that it had never really been tried. Perhaps the same could be said about comprehensive planning in education.

Number Nine

One hundred years ago most Americans still believed strongly in the desirability of involving many hundreds of people in school decisions. Every township, village and hamlet (outside the South) had its own school board. Most of the large cities were organized by wards, each having its own board, and together forming a central board, which in Boston and Philadelphia numbered more than a hundred members at the peak of citizen involvement. Why did this pattern change?

Horace Mann was dismayed at the inadequacies of the tiny village school committees. As secretary of education in Massachusetts, he campaigned hard for the consolidation of district school committees, in effect launching a movement that continues to this day. One consequence was a gradual reduction in the number of citizens who participated in month-to-month decision making about educational issues at the local level.

Meanwhile, urban school reformers fought hard for the elimination of patronage and corruption in city school systems. Textbook scandals, payments to secure positions, squabbles over construction contracts—these widely publicized problems gave impetus to a drive to "professionalize" and centralize city schools around the turn of the century.

School administrators have been taught that these reforms were both necessary and productive. Both the agrarian and urban reform movements made possible the emergence of a strong superintendent empowered to nominate teachers, principals, and other staff members. Smaller boards, usually elected at large and in nonpartisan elections, appeared to attract decision makers who were better educated and thus potentially more responsible than the mass of citizens.

Yet in the 1970's a new breed of reformers calls for "community control," extensive decentralization, "breaking up the system," voucher plans, and returning "power to the people." School systems across the country are flayed as joyless, grim, repressive, rigid and even genocidal in their impact on the minds of children. What happened? And what are the more constructive responses to the crisis of confidence in what most educators thought to be a successful movement to professionalize and centralize educational decision making?

The Quest for Accountability

Teachers and principals now are accountable—to the superintendent and the school board. Accountability means that they are held responsible or liable for the educational progress, as well as for the health and safety, of children in school. But in a hundred or more county and city school districts, parents complain that the school board is remote and takes little positive action when either the progress or safety of children is at stake.

What are the alternatives? The December 1970 issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan* includes eight major articles on accountability and major proposals such as performance contracting and improved information systems.

Elsewhere, Alan Altshuler in his book, *Community Control*, identifies three points of special concern to the black community in cities:

1. Devolution of as much authority as possible to neighborhood communities

2. Direct representation of such communities on the city council, the board of education, the police commission, and other significant policy bodies.

Joseph M. Cronin, professor, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, prepared this article, "Community Involvement in Educational Policy-Making," for *The School Administrator*. It is the ninth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."

3. Black representation at all levels of public service in far more than token numbers.

The more recently organized Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Chinese, and Indians are only beginning to voice the very substantial concerns they have about the treatment of their children in schools and classrooms.

Still another reform proposal is that of educational vouchers, a scheme for consumer choice advanced for several centuries by economists, beginning with Adam Smith. A 1970 version with provisions to prevent racial separatism or get-rich-quick entrepreneurship has been proposed by Christopher Jencks and Walter McCann. The plan is unlikely to sweep the country overnight, and even its advocates have called for a careful six-to-eight-year trial of the plan in various settings. Meanwhile, almost every major teacher and administrator group has denounced the plan even before studying the adequacy of the safeguards. At the same time, Dean Dwight Allen of the University of Massachusetts has proposed a limited voucher system of choices within a public school system, an idea which will calm some critics while stimulating competition between schools in a city or county area.

Each of these proposals stresses accomplishment of results as the single most important feature. Community control stresses the possibilities of improving results through close supervision and selection of personnel and programs. Performance contracting suggests the need for drastically different incentive schemes to bring about progress and does not substantially alter the present system of governance. Voucher plans presumably would lead to some new schools (although many existing schools would remain popular) but without dramatic changes in governance. Children or their parents would simply vote with their feet, leaving the inadequate school in search of the achieving school.

The Inadequacy of Existing Mechanisms

Educators face the charge that they have at every turn deliberately frozen out minority groups or community spokesmen during the past two decades. Yet school administrators have tried dozens of techniques and strategies to bring the schools closer to the people and vice-versa. The most widely trusted of these methods warrant some review:

• The *citizens advisory committee* grew popular in the 1950's, as a result of the pioneering work of Roy E. Larsen and thousands of citizen leaders anxious to restore public confidence in the public schools. These volunteer committees continue to assist school boards, pass bond issues, work for more adequate budgets, and in other ways support efforts to maintain and expand school services. Unfortunately, these groups have withered away in working-class suburbs and cities, or remain simply as forums for well-educated elites. In Cook County suburbs and Long Island school districts, such groups serve as screening councils or caucuses for candidates for the school board. In a few instances citizen committees have helped to prepare a system to accept the principles of racial justice, as in the case of Pittsburgh in the mid-60's, but too often the new issues of race and adequate representation have escaped the attention of these committees. Such groups have rarely recruited or attracted poor people or minority representation, even if the committees themselves were sympathetic.

• The *public hearing* has in many cities become a kind of ritualized drama where each pressure group, parental or professional, draws a five-minute turn at the microphone in which to plead for proper recognition of the need for funds and services. Former New York City Board member John Lotz has criticized public boards for discussing important items at informal meetings and then just listening impassively to comments at public meetings, giving an impression of bloodlessness and "sphinx-like disinterest." His report to the Citizens Committee for Children in New York City proposed dozens of recommendations to streamline board meetings, provide the public with background information and phone numbers of resource persons in advance of meetings, and change the locale of board meetings to bring them to various schools.

• The use of *television coverage* so far in most large cities reflects the essential innocence most educators retain about the nature of the medium. Several city boards preserve intact the old stereotyped agenda format and with the cameras present escalate their criticism of the staff and each other. For a while Houston citizens called their televised school board meetings the Monday Night Fights, and in other cities the sobriquet "School Board Laugh-In" has been tied to similar shows. By its nature, television attracts the publicity seeker and rewards the individual or group that demonstrates, remonstrates, or disrupts a meeting. Schoolmen and boards have not yet learned to use the electronic media to present alternative plans and then invite citizen feedback by adapting the "talk show" or citizen phone-in format. The conventional use of television coverage has, for the most part, probably undermined public confidence in the effectiveness of public decision-making boards. Yet the media can handle a variety of ingenious interactive approaches, some of them yet to be devised but presumably possible through the emerging technology of cable TV, the telephone, and the computer. These may make obsolete within the decade the traditional and expensive forms of referenda or town meetings in which voters must turn out in poor weather rather than vote from their kitchen or living room.

38

Some Interim Proposals

The technology and software for new modes of citizen involvement require further development. What can be done immediately? The Boston School Committee and the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education cosponsored a major study of the Boston school department which included an evaluation of the adequacy of existing school–community relations. The final report, "Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity," presents a number of recommendations toward what Chandler Stevens of M.I.T. calls a "citizen information system," part of a new approach to educational decision making on program and policy issues.

Discussions and systematic interviews with Boston parents revealed that many were frustrated with the schools as they existed. Yet they did not want to abolish the system or acquire the right summarily to dismiss the principal, a concern that makes many educators understandably fear community control. Two-thirds of the parents interviewed wanted more of a voice in the decisions, but with the professional staff participating, too. Under the existing centralized system (one five-man lay board for more than 90,000 children) parents felt they had very little control over decisions that affected their children.

One very central recommendation was the creation of school councils consisting of parents, teachers, and students, with the principal as an ex officio member. Unlike some of the experiments in New York City, the creation of school councils in several Boston public schools contributed greatly to the political efficacy of parents who saw a need for major changes in the staffing and organization of their schools. The famous Quincy School (now serving the Chinese population), the Martin Luther King Middle School, and the Solomon Lewenberg School were among those that relied heavily on parent, community, and student advice in planning major improvements in program and facilities. The hiring of community persons as aides and coordinators was in each instance a critical factor in the success of the councils in restoring confidence in the schools.

Altshuler and others recommend community elections despite the notoriously low turnout in special neighborhood elections. In New York City, a number of the community school board elections were won by parochial school parents whose platform stressed concern that federal and state funds would flow as entitled to nonpublic schools. The Boston proposal calls for election of five parent representatives and three educators to an executive board for each school. Each school would send a representative to an area council or board to plan for a network of schools, perhaps those feeding a senior high school or identified with a definable geographical entity.

Councils would be formed at the request of 10 or more parents at each school. Officers of an executive board would be consulted on the school budget and major staff changes and building alterations. They would develop criteria for the selection of principals and headmasters (for example, "experience in working with antipoverty agencies" or "bilingual program leadership skills"). They would make reviews at least once each year and make recommendations concerning a "school achievement profile."

School officials, using their data processing capacities, would annually prepare information on each school: the number of teachers and their level of experience; the special programs, aides, and extra staff available; dropout rates, known college acceptances, and other career data; test scores by grade and subject or skill area; school expenditures for teachers and counselors, custodians, books and materials, repairs, lunch programs, and special staff; and projected enrollments for the next three years.

Henry Dyer, an officer of the Educational Testing Service, has proposed a School Effectiveness Index that could carefully point out the strengths and weaknesses of a school program. Standard reports of school achievement scores and test averages yield very little information of use to either staff or citizen groups. The SEI, described in the December 1970 *Phi Delta Kappan,* is the kind of accountability profile that citizens will begin to request from central school boards, or from states if necessary.

Those who question the legality or wisdom of releasing such data must note the momentum behind the consumer movement. State legislatures are likely to pass Right To Know statutes and otherwise direct the release of such information if school officials balk at requests for information on school performance. At the same time, educators in school systems and universities have an obligation to provide short-term training institutes so that parents and children can learn how to interpret test results and evaluate alternative responses.

One example of community involvement in a policy decision in Boston is the action taken to issue a performance contract in a Roxbury school where reading skills were lagging. Both a Title I Advisory Council and the Education Committee of an AntiPoverty Council urged that such an experiment be tried, but without the possibly destructive bonus gifts to children on completion of tests. Citizens will want to make and monitor such decisions which touch the lives and shape the subsequent career opportunities of their children.

The Ombudsman and Opinion Survey

The Boston Report also calls for an ombudsman to investigate citizen or consumer complaints about the system. Based on the Scandinavian experience reported by Wal-

39

ter Gellhorn in *Ombudsmen and Others,* a number of colleges have already established such a position. An ombudsman operates best as an impartial, independent investigator and not as an employee of the board or agency. He inspects records and documents, listens to testimony, and renders a report on whether justice has prevailed. Such a role can be useful in the larger school systems.

Administrators in other countries endorse the ombudsman concept because it protects them from unjust complaints and extremist criticism. At the same time, the arbitrary or capricious administrator is rebuked for failing to consult with others who share responsibility for decisions.

Educators and school systems can also adopt the "market survey" approach at frequent intervals to find out what problems trouble the electorate or constituencies within it, such as ethnic or racial minorities. Regrettably, the public opinion poll is viewed as a tool suitable only for Madison Avenue or for expensive political campaign consulting firms. Yet a small HEW grant of less than $12,000 to Jeffrey Raffel, a young political scientist, made possible the interviewing of 400 Boston parents on their expectations, sources of information, and other concerns about the school system.

Too many administrators, in the absence of such surveys or polls, find that the annual budget election or bond issue serves the identical function of registering dissatisfaction —with disastrous result. Voters feel no one is listening and thus vote *no* to protest their specific gripes about the schools or their general frustration over rising taxes. The budget is then cut, sometimes across the board, without much careful analysis of the reason for the negative response from the citizenry.

McLuhan and others warn us that the electronic age in which we live threatens all established institutions. School systems can hardly be excepted. The test is to harness the new technologies in such a way as to express our genuine concern for human feelings, to exchange information and understand the messages our fellow man yearns to communicate. The school council, accountability profile, ombudsman, and opinion surveys are some of the new kinds of governance needed to make our schools responsive to community expectations.

References

1. Altshuler, Alan. *Community Control.* New York: Pegasus, 1970.

2. Center for the Study of Public Policy. *Education Vouchers: A Report on Financing Elementary Education by Grants to Parents.* Cambridge: the Center, December 1970.

3. Cronin, Joseph, *et al. Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity.* Boston: The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, 1970.

4. Dyer, Henry. "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City." *Phi Delta Kappan* 52:206-11; December 1970.

5. Gellhorn, Walter. *Ombudsmen and Others.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

6. Lotz, John. *Modernization of the Public Meeting Process of the New York City Board of Education.* Part One. New York: Citizens Committee for Children, 1970.

Number Ten

The problem of public support for nonpublic schools is almost an American classic, having erupted and subsided at various intervals throughout this century. But never before has it been as politically hot as it is now, and it is going to get hotter before this decade is half over.

What are some of the major dimensions of the problem? What are the critical issues involved in addressing it? What options are available to us in seeking a resolution? It is to questions such as these that this article is addressed.

In order to scrutinize the real hub of the problem, we shall limit our consideration of nonpublic schools primarily to Catholic elementary and secondary schools. There are two main reasons for this approach. First, Catholic schools enroll a vast majority of the nonpublic pupils in America. Second, focus on Catholic schools will force us to confront the religious issue and will help to highlight the political concomitants of the problem. Moreover, the manifest conditions that seem largely responsible for sparking the current heated debate—declining enrollments and school closures—are almost exclusively Catholic school phenomena.

I. THE PROBLEM

In examining the problem of public support for Catholic schools, it is necessary to explore the history of changes that have brought Catholic schools to their current state of crisis, and, hence, have led to demands from Catholic educators for increased public support. These changes help clarify several dimensions of the problem, four of which we shall consider here.

Philosophical Dimensions

It is well known that the Catholic Church is undergoing some fundamental changes. One sees daily evidence of increasing liberalization and flexibility in the interpretation of traditional values and doctrines. Especially in America, the Church is striving to become more "relevant" to the needs and interests of its clientele. The "philosophical revolution" has, as Stronck indicates,[2] had an impact on Catholics' expectations and perceptions of their schools. To understand this impact it is important to recall the historical goals of Catholic schools in the United States.

The "siege mentality" that led to the widespread establishment of Catholic schools in this country was largely religiously motivated. The schools were founded in protest against the emergent system of public schools, which were viewed as instruments of Protestantism. Soon, another reason for the expansion of Catholic education was found—the need to protect many of the European imigrants from ethnic persecution in the public schools. Eventually, however, the public schools were largely purged of religious and ethnic bias and the "siege mentality" waned.

In recent years we have seen a growing secularization of Catholic schools.

Concomitantly, some hard questions are being asked by those associated with American Catholicism. Church officials wonder whether their rising expenditures on the schools constitute the best use of the Church's resources. Parents wonder what the Catholic schools can offer their children that the public schools cannot, and whether any uniqueness justifies the substantial financial sacrifice that is required. And religious orders wonder whether Catholic schools offer the best placements for their personnel. (In 1950 about 90 percent of Catholic school teachers were religious; in 1960 the proportion had dropped to less than 75 percent; in

---

Robin H. Farquhar, chairman, Department of Educational Administration, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada, prepared this article. It is the tenth in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."

1965 it was under 65 percent; and now it is only about 50 percent.[3])

Such questioning indicates a growing crisis of confidence in the Catholic schools. It seems obvious that recent closures and cutbacks reflect patron defections for reasons much more complicated than money alone.

Demographic Dimensions

About half of the Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States are located in urban or inner-city areas—almost twice as many as are found in the suburbs.[4] This is because of the early objective of Catholic schools to meet the needs of immigrants, who initially settled in urban centers. These patrons tended to represent the lower socioeconomic strata. As Erickson observes, they were seldom critical of the work of professional educators and "could tolerate conditions widely regarded as substandard—such as class sizes virtually unheard of in public education, untrained, underpaid teachers, and primitive facilities and equipment."[5]

With the passage of time, however, the "melting pot" did its work and the American Catholic population became increasingly less lower class and more middle class. Catholics were no longer willing to tolerate schools—public or nonpublic—that were academically inferior. Moreover, the wealthier among them moved to the suburbs, where the public schools were viewed as superior to those in the urban centers. At the same time, the costs of education were rising dramatically.

What has resulted from these demographic shifts in the Catholic population is an ironic dilemma. A large proportion of Catholic schools are located in the urban centers where the need for alternatives to the public schools is greatest, but the Catholics who live there can ill afford to support these schools at a level that would enable them to become attractive alternatives to the public schools. On the other hand, the Catholics who could afford to adequately support their schools live in the suburbs where, for reasons mentioned previously, Catholic alternatives to the public schools are being increasingly viewed as unnecessary.

Economic Dimensions

Unquestionably, financial difficulties represent a major component of the current Catholic school crisis. On the expenditure side of the ledger, school costs have risen sharply in both the public and nonpublic sectors.[6] But the Catholic schools have been particularly hard hit. Despite drops in enrollment, total expenditures in Catholic schools have increased by about 13 percent within the past two years.

The chief causes of these increases are subtle but significant. First, as mentioned above, substantial efforts are being made to improve the quality of Catholic education through lowering class sizes, raising teacher qualifications, and purchasing more current instructional materials. Such changes cost money. And second, Catholic school teachers are becoming much more expensive. Not only have there been increases in "cash payments in lieu of salary" made to religious staff, but also, as noted before, the proportion of lay teachers in Catholic schools is rising rapidly. Salaries for lay teachers must be kept reasonably competitive with those for public school teachers, and the former are adopting some of the strategies of the latter to ensure that this occurs.

On the income side of the ledger, money for education generally is becoming much harder to raise, as illustrated by the growing resistance to tax increases for public schools. But here again the Catholic schools are in a particularly difficult position, for several reasons. First, all Catholic school patrons must help meet the rising income needs of both public and nonpublic schools—the "double taxation" problem. Second, Catholic schools must compete with other increasingly expensive services for a share of the Church's general revenue. Third, as the proportion of lay teachers in the Catholic schools increases, income in the form of "contributed service" by religious staff decreases. Finally, income needs are greatest where the ability to pay is lowest.

Clearly, Catholic schools are in a financial bind. Growing deficits have necessitated enrollment cutbacks and school closures, with consequent added burdens on the public schools. So it should surprise no one that Catholic educators are seeking public support to help bail out their schools. In light of the philosophical and demographic phenomena noted earlier, however, it is not at all clear to what extent the Catholic school closures and cutbacks are financially caused and to what extent they result from other factors. Accordingly, it can be seriously questioned whether public support can resolve the Catholic school problem.

Political Dimensions

As battles over this issue have been fought in the Congress and state legislatures, several arguments have been advanced, and various organizations have lobbied strenuously in support of each side of the debate.

The argument most commonly offered in favor of proposals for governmental assistance is that it is more expensive to the public for nonpublic (particularly Catholic) schools to close (because public funds would be required to support the entire education of former Catholic school students) than to provide aid to partially support Catholic school operations. Another common argument on this side is that nonpublic schools perform a public service, serve a secular function, and protect the values of diversity, freedom of choice, and healthy competition in American education.

The most frequently heard argument against public support of Catholic schools is that such aid is unconstitutional because it violates the "Establishment Clause" of the First Amendment. It is further claimed that the "religious" and "secular" components of instruction cannot be

42

separated in Catholic education. Other arguments commonly advanced are that public aid to Catholic schools would "columnize" society along religious and ethnic lines, would deprive the public schools of tax revenues which they badly need and would otherwise get, would make public schools "dumping grounds" or "schools of last resort" for difficult-to-educate children, and would lead to public controls that would deprive nonpublic schools of their distinctive qualities.

At this time it appears that although proponents of public aid to nonpublic schools have lost numerous battles in the courts and legislatures, they are slowly winning the war. The primary reason is that the political pressures they have mounted have been stronger than those mounted by the opposition. Those favoring aid are better organized for political purposes have better access to public influence mechanisms, and have a more visible cause (fighting for the "financial life" of their schools) than do their opponents. Moreover, aid proponents are, with experience, becoming increasingly astute politically, and their numbers are swelling.

Nevertheless, those opposed to public support are gradually being shaken out of their political apathy, because of such factors as taxpayer revolts and the projected voucher experiments. They are forming new coalitions to fight increases in public aid, and it is apparent that they are preparing to enter the political arena with renewed determination. It will definitely get messier; whether or not American education will come out ahead is not yet clear.

II. THE ISSUES

Let us take a brief look now at three of the central issues that must be considered by policy makers as they confront this complex problem.

Constitutionality

The words "wall of separation between church and state" are not found in the United States Constitution. Rather, they define an early construction of the First Amendment's "Establishment Clause." Over the years, interpretations by the U.S. Supreme Court have become progressively less restrictive.[7] The historical concept of an unbreachable wall between church and state has now been weakened by the Court to the point where Litka and Trubac conclude that "if the justices are able to find a secular purpose for a challenged enactment and label this purpose as the primary effect of the act, the legislative action can withstand First Amendment arguments even though it definitely aids a religious cause."[8] The outlook for those who would fight public support for nonpublic schools on the basis of constitutionality, then, does not seem very promising.

Freedom of Choice

There has been, is, and probably always will be a need for public schools in this country. Yet, it somehow seems at odds with the goals of a great free enterprise nation to permit parents no real choices in so important an area as education. Some parents do have freedom of choice—those who are financially able to support both the public schools and the nonpublic schools they choose to patronize, but even they are punished economically for choosing nonpublic schools. The poor lack even the opportunity to choose.

Obviously, if freedom of choice were to be facilitated through increased public support of nonpublic schools, it would be essential to build in controls to ensure that all students had equal access to the schools. And this is where the real crunch comes, for nonpublic schools can sustain only so much governmental control without losing their distinctiveness as viable alternatives to the public schools. This may be the most crucial problem the OEO voucher experiments will confront.

Societal Effects

Are nonpublic schools worth preserving? It is not at all clear what their impact upon societal progress is, or would be under conditions of increased public support. Catholic schools are accused of divisiveness, but they counter with data suggesting that their graduates contribute at least as much to the country's general welfare as do Catholic graduates from public schools. They are accused of academic inferiority, but they counter with data suggesting that their graduates do as well in the universities as do Catholic graduates from public schools. They claim to promote the diversity essential to a pluralistic society, but they are apparently becoming increasingly similar to public schools. They claim to provide parents with opportunities to exercise their right of free choice, but they admit their students selectively.

Since it is not known with certainty what the societal effects of Catholic schools are, it is futile to try to predict without further systematic research what their impact would be under conditions of expanded public support. Nor does it help much to examine the experiences of other countries whose governments provide substantial assistance to nonpublic schools. As Erickson points out, the results vary markedly within and among nations.[9]

At a more specific level, what are the effects of Catholic schools on the public schools? While many effects have been postulated, few have been empirically examined. At least two, however, seem irrefutable. On the negative side, as long as nonpublic schools are permitted total freedom to select their students, the public schools will serve as "receptacles" for nonpublic school rejects. Governmental aid will augment this effect unless regulations are applied to prevent it.

On the positive side, as long as nonpublic schools effect the injection of private resources into American education, they save the public money. It is for this reason that the principle of fractionality in public support is important; no aid program should permit the government to completely subsidize nonpublic education.

43

III. CONCLUSION

What options are available to educational policy makers in seeking a solution to the problem characterized by the complex issues noted above? Short of precipitously cutting off all government aid for nonpublic education, which would be disastrous for all schools, there appear to be three main alternatives, each based on different assumptions and objectives.[10] The first, based on the assumption that the phasing out of many nonpublic schools is unavoidable in light of some of the problems discussed previously, would involve providing them just enough aid to "soften the blow" on the public schools as the phase-out occurs. The second alternative, based on the assumption that the existing balance between public and nonpublic education is desirable, would involve providing nonpublic schools with enough aid to maintain their current level of operations. The third alternative, based on the assumption that a new system of public and nonpublic options could reform and revitalize American education, would involve developing substantial and creative programs of public support for nonpublic schools.

The first two of these alternatives are currently the most widely supported. The provision of auxiliary services (speech, guidance, health, transportation, etc.) is negligible in impact; it can slow the phase-out but it cannot stop it. The same is true of shared-time and released-time arrangements. The more recently instituted "purchase-of-secular-services" programs in several states provide much more substantial aid to help meet salaries and other instructional costs; these plans could stem the phase-out and preserve the present balance.

Neither of these approaches, however, is capable of stimulating really new options in education. Moreover, they both serve to maintain the inequality of educational opportunity now so characteristic of both public (because of residential patterns) and nonpublic (because of pupil selectivity) schools.

The third alternative, attempting reform through creating a new system, would seek to overcome the inadequacies in the first two approaches. It is toward this end that OEO's projected experiment with the "regulated compensatory model" of the voucher system is directed. Whether or not vouchers can help achieve the ambitious objectives of the third alternative cannot be known without very thorough, systematic, long-term testing. But they appear to have more potential for success than any other plan that has been proposed.

Whether this potential can ever be realized, however, will likely depend more on political than on educational considerations.

Footnotes

1. For providing information helpful in the preparation of this article, the author is grateful to Dr. Edward R. D'Alessio, United States Catholic Conference; Dr. Donald A. Erickson, The University of Chicago; Bishop William E. McManus, member of the President's Panel on Nonpublic Education and Commission on School Finance; and the Reverend John F. Myers, National Catholic Educational Association. The views expressed in the article are the author's and are not necessarily shared by these individuals.

2. Stronck, David R. "The Changing Catholic Philosophy of Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 52:303-304; January 1971.

3. National Catholic Educational Association. *A Statistical Report on Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools for the Years 1967-68 to 1969-70*. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1970. pp. 5, 13-14.

4. *Ibid*, p. 8.

5. Erickson, Donald A. *Crisis in Illinois Public Schools*. Final Research Report to the Elementary and Secondary Nonpublic Schools Study Commission, State of Illinois, Springfield: the Commission, 1971. Chapter 4, p. 6. (Mimeographed—now in press)

6. Cost data are drawn from *A Statistical Report on Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools for the Years 1967-68 to 1969-70*, pp. 19-20.

7. For a historical summary of major positions taken in interpreting the First Amendment, see Erickson, Donald A. "Central Constitutional Questions on Aid to Nonpublic Schools." *State Government* 43:244-49; Autumn 1970.

8. Litka, Michael P., and Trubac, Edward R. "Aid to Private Schools." *Momentum*, February 1971. p. 6.

9. Erickson, Donald A. "Public Funds for Private Schools." *Saturday Review*, September 21, 1968. p. 67.

10. These alternatives are discussed at some length in Erickson, *Crisis in Illinois Public Schools*, Chapter 2, p. 11.

44

Number Eleven

The politics of desegregation can be viewed on one hand as the organized affairs of a governmental power or, on the other hand, as the relationship between competing interest groups or individuals for power and/or leadership. For the purpose of this article, politics of desegregation is being viewed as the total complex of interrelations between man and society as it relates to education. Within this context, the politics of desegregation resides primarily and principally in the realm of multiple human interaction. Governmental, political, and judicial considerations reflect segments of structured variables as applied to desegregation. However, multiple factors do indeed exist within the realm of human exchange reflecting both positive and negative educational oriented modifications as applied to the problem of desegregation of the nation's schools. There are those who are convinced that an active conspiracy exists dedicated toward a series of carefully constructed delay tactics. Contrary to the above, the perceptions of others reflect organized efforts to bring about dramatic and immediate change in the desegregation arena. Perhaps, to a limited degree, both elements exist. Yet experience and factual data reveal multiple and divergent activities underway within and between competing and cooperating segments of the whole fabric of society.

The very nature of the current relationships between man and society relative to desegregation implies unrest. In fact, if one were to search for a single word to convey thoughts, movements, and undertones of present activities, the most singular descriptor would be "unrest." Unrest implies both positive and negative involvements; support components energizing more forceful and immediate movement exist within certain realms while these same components, in turn, are being countermanded under systems of more active resistance. The unrest factor implies a tug-of-war between the competing interest groups reflecting divergent power structures and the struggle for multiple leadership. Unrest, with its implications, is not necessarily more negative than positive. To the contrary, unrest implies the need for forward momentum; an opportunity to direct change and modification of events in such a way that maximum good results. The direction of change, the impact of change, the positive or negative implications (depending upon definition and strategies) which will result from elements of unrest reside primarily in the ultimate commitment of the school administrator and the multiple political groups he must harmonize.

The current movement in education, presently taking cohesive shape, will develop into a defined structure during the 1970's and will, to a great extent, constitute the framework for future educational decisions.

We have finally come to realize that events confronting the politics of desegregation present significant educational opportunities for progress on one hand; and severe challenges, frustrations and painful adjustments within the educational scene on the other. In a sense, the future of the public school structure depends upon the school superintendent and his understanding of the politics of school desegregation.

Considerable dialogue and interaction with administrators throughout the country substantiate the fact that there is little theoretical opposition regarding the need or the urgency

---

Morrill M. Hall, professor of educational administration and director, Center for Educational Improvement, University of Georgia, Athens, and John P. Van Deusen, associate professor, Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, prepared this article, "The Politics of School Desegregation," for *The School Administrator*. It is the eleventh in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."

to desegregate the nation's schools. The dilemma of the superintendent resides in the demands of competing interest groups and the threats of multiple confrontations. These threat situations result almost entirely from the lack of experience of school administrators in the realm of human interaction and the subtle and obvious vested interest groups that must be given significant consideration. The "tried and true" of the past no longer applies. In the past, school administrators enjoyed an empirical advantage in that careful assessment of events and circumstances in a restricted categorical hierarchy yielded firm and definitive solutions to existing problems. Empirical answers are no longer available. Today, under the pressures of the politics of desegregation, multiple forces are affecting the school administrator, his role, his responsibilities, and his effectiveness in dealing with reality.

What then are the priorities of politics which must be dealt with by the conscientious and effective superintendent? What are the real values and how can the school administrator identify and understand the multiple force factors with which he must contend? A recent appraisal of events, experiences, articles, professional references, documentation from governmental agencies and educational research indicate that in both the South and the North the following concepts are relevant to the politics of desegregation.

Local Subtle Power Structures

Within every community facing the politics of desegregation a school administrator must be cognizant of implications representing the subtle structures and their vested interests. What is being referred to here is sometimes defined as the "White-Shoes" group which manipulates the vocal and obvious community groups. For lack of a better term we will refer to this subtle and extremely discreet power group as those representing the "iceberg" syndrome. As in the instance of the iceberg, the real weight and mass are out of view below the surface. However, the fact that it is difficult to recognize does not diminish its importance. Every competing interest group has behind it a subtle and yet extremely powerful and influential "iceberg group." The names of these individuals do not appear in local papers, no publicity is offered on their behalf, and, in fact, they make every effort to remain anonymous and unknown. To be visible and exposed implies a delimiting effect. Yet this "White-Shoes" group existing in every community (regardless of size or locale) is unquestionably the most significant, powerful and persuasive element influencing the vocal and obvious community pressure groups. The knowledgeable and effective school administrator must somehow extend his pipeline below the surface in order to be fully apprised and cognizant of events. Although he will never be a part of these groups, and will rarely interact at an intimate level, he must somehow accurately assess their whims and objectives. To be unaware of the impact of these political groups is to invite serious complication and difficulty; to ignore their existence completely is an invitation to chaos.

Obvious Community Pressure Groups

Consistent with the above concerns, the politics of desegregation must address itself to the inter- and intra-concepts, aspirations and value systems displayed by community groups. Recent studies clearly indicate dramatic differences within the concepts, attitudes and processes of actualization applied to differential community groups. Whereas the traditional pressure groups of the past have been concerned with what has become categorically defined as white, protestant and middle class, the divergent pressure groups today are concerned with specific vested interests. For example, a community group reflecting the disadvantaged strata might concern itself with educational programs pursuant to viable and relevant vocational-technical training programs. At the same time, a group reflecting the advantaged middle class might concern itself with educational activities principally oriented toward academics as applied to the college bound candidate. A vocal group of citizens may band together insisting upon expanded early childhood centers to be followed by an equally dedicated group concerned with increased educational opportunities for the gifted student. The superintenent must consider and evaluate the conflicting desires and aspirations of these community pressure groups. Unquestionably, the events of desegregation have given emphasis to community group involvements, and the impact on the nation's school administrators is, to say the least, substantial.

Obvious Parental Pressure Groups

In addition to the community groups mentioned above, the school administrator concerned with the politics of desegregation must address himself to the subtle and the obvious parental pressure groups which have decided effects on school operation. These obvious parental pressure groups, which have become evident in PTA and other standard parent oriented activities, are not a new concern. We have developed processes and techniques of interaction for the obvious parental groups which, while not entirely satisfactory, have been reasonably satisfying. Within the unrest and anxiety atmosphere of desegregation the subtle parental pressure groups must be given more direct attention. To ignore these groups is to invite unexpected confrontation with parents, often resulting in unreasonable and impossible demands.

Authoritarian Pressure Groups

The politics of desegregation frequently brings into conflict or

harmony, contingent upon events, authoritative pressure groups reflecting federal levels, state levels and local administrative boards. To be more specific, the Department of Justice, the U.S. Office of Education in conjunction with Health, Education and Welfare, legislative acts of the state in conjunction with the State Department of Education and the regulations and policies of the local school board all reflect unrest and considerable administrative pressure. Administrators involved in the politics of desegregation can testify to the fact that competition, conflict, anxiety, and, in some instances, animosity exist within and between divergent administrative authority groups. The urgency of the administrator's concern in these instances is indeed obvious; to fail to comply with a duly authorized and legal body is an invitation to legal or professional censure. The administrator also resides in a local setting and, therefore, must give extended consideration to the immediate environment. When local policy is found to be incompatible with state or federal policy, the expeditious administrator must make an effort to interpret, to clarify and to advise pursuant to problematical responses. Therefore, continued dialogue is mandatory between the local administrator and multiple authority agents; the local superintendent and his representatives must continue to maintain dialogue and open lines of communication with the state and federal agencies. Regrettably, no clear charts exist for this course of action. Occasional confrontation will be experienced; implications must be carefully assessed. Regardless of the outcome, the effective administrator under the politics of desegregation must be informed, must honestly advise, and must take steps to protect his legal and administrative role as the responsible agent of the school.

Surface and Sub-Surface Student Groups

For the first time in the history of American education, and particularly as a result of desegregation, administrators must carefully assess the effects of student pressure groups. The student unrest movement originating on the college campus is unquestionably migrating downward to the secondary schools. Whereas many administrators are disgruntled and openly resent student involvement and student demands, the fact is that student groups remain a powerful factor. Many administrators now recognize that students should have input into specific concerns of the local school. After all, the students are what it is all about. Although chronological age patterns of student bodies have not changed significantly over the years, the sophistication, tools and perceptions of students themselves have changed in a marked and rather dramatic fashion. Student concern for school environment and what happens to them in the educative process is an unrest factor deserving consideration. In this vein one need only to consider the active as well as the passive resistance students are displaying toward the administrative "establishment." To be sure, this is symptomatic of the unrest factors and anxiety patterns cited earlier. Perhaps it is conceivable that the unrest displayed by students goes deeper than the surface demands which are more obvious. We have been guilty on many occasions of a faulty diagnosis. It is conceivable that student citizens are more cognizant of certain realms of social responsibility than the adult citizens. Regardless of one's perception, the school administrator can find himself unwillingly trapped in the position of conflict between student expectations and the pressures of divergent groups which reflect cross-elements of society. Nonetheless, the secondary students of today are the voting citizens of tomorrow. The skills, aspirations, frustrations and judgmental references underlying student behavior will ultimately be transmitted to parental and community involvements. To ignore student requests today is to invite unreasonable demands tomorrow.

Surface and Sub-Surface Professional Groups

Professional personnel, at both the sub-surface and surface levels, must be considered within the total complex of human relations applied to politics of desegregation. Many teachers (at the public verbal level) openly applaud the more massive movements of student populations reflected within the desegregated school setting. There is, however, an opposite side of the coin which reflects teachers exhibiting more or less resistance to the unified school. This does not connote responses by a particular minority or majority teaching group, but rather reflects attitudes and values of individual teaching personnel. Teachers, as is the case with all human beings, are subject to bias and prejudice acquired during past exposure and prior experience. Though many attitudes are subtle and diminished, they are discernable. Southern schools as well as northern schools frequently encounter teachers displaying somewhat hostile reactions to particular students. With the advent of teachers representing divergent racial backgrounds, the predictable "whiplash" effect is being observed. Those teachers who for too long have been suppressed and relegated toward inferior roles are now included in the desegregated school setting and are accordingly exhibiting negative interpersonal responses. Teachers and other professional personnel set the emotional climate for learning within the desegregated schools. Furthermore, their attitudes, comments, and interactions with the multiple groups served by the school reflect the problems of desegregation. In order to remain effective and fully functioning, the administrator must be cognizant of the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of unrest as transmitted by professional personnel.

New Curricular and Administrative Models

Regardless of one's geographic proximity, the loudest and most

47

vocal cry pursuant to the politics of desegregation reflects a universal concern for the maintenance of quality education. As a result, the question now arises as to what is quality education; quality education implying certain educational experiences for one group, with yet another rather different set of educational criteria applied to another group. The search and demand for quality education, therefore, bears roots in the very foundations of curriculum structure. A standard and stereotyped curriculum reflecting pedestrian teaching practices will no longer stand the test of relevant and productive pedagogics. The concern for quality education has given emphasis to an overdue examination of productive curriculum models and can only be defined in terms of a new and comprehensive set of educational objectives. The test of quality education over the past decades has been predicated upon a deferred value judgment; education reflecting opportunities which had no immediate value but which, ultimately, would yield skills and concepts applied at some future point. Today, within the setting of the desegregated school, we are forced to test the hypothesis of relevancy.

Relevancy implies not only the question of what to teach but, of equal importance, the question of how to teach effectively within the desegregated model. Teaching proficiency and teacher accountability are responses to interest engendered by the multiple publics involved. The degree of actual student accomplishment and specific learning outcomes reflect professional and curricular unrest in the desegregated school setting. In our haste to resolve current concerns within the desegregated school, there is a normal tendency to replace an older set of curricular structures with another, yet equally restricting, new set of structures. The task is not this easy. For example, the assessment of mathematics achievement, reading proficiency, grammatical sequence and biological phylum is relatively simple. On the other hand, the assessment of total language development, environmental relationships, economic interdependence and self actualization is not so easily accomplished. Recent studies clearly indicate dramatic differences in concepts, attitudes and self actualization processes as applied to divergent sub-groups. When one's self perceptions reveal low aspirational levels, weak (or even negative) self concept and social perceptions of a different orientation, it cannot but make a difference in what is really a relevant curriculum. Desegregated schools, in order to honor their commitment to public education, must reflect a positive climate supporting growth within related sociopersonal profiles in a similar manner as growth within academic profiles. As a result of socio-curricular considerations which come to the foreground within the desegregated setting, the search for a relevant curriculum recognizing the value and capabilities of every individual student must be reflected in new school models. In brief, the unfolding curriculum of the 70's will determine the maintenance of public education for the twenty-first century.

Summary

The public school administrator today is faced with new problems, multiple pressures and divergent groups competing for interest, power and leadership. The administrator capable of survival must include an active consideration of the multiple publics. Foremost among these are: (a) power structures including the obvious and less discernible; (b) vocal and nonvocal community groups; (c) obvious and subtle parental pressure groups; (d) administrative groups reflecting divergent strategies; (e) surface and sub-surface student groups; and (f) divergent professional responses within and between the multi-ethnic groups. Of equal importance is the search, with a test of relevancy, for new curricular and administrative designs satisfying the idealisms of youth, yet compatible with the traditions of the past.

The task appears almost overwhelming. Yet, the nation's school administrators have never failed to implement and operate effective school programs. At the present time of crisis and unrest public schools continue to improve.

Contrary to the beliefs of many, the long-range effects of the politics of desegregation will ultimately yield dramatically improved school programs throughout the nation. The quasi-standard and sometimes unproductive limitations attached to traditional schools of the past can no longer survive; politically comprehensive and unified school programs will reach all children in a more positive manner. Unquestionably, as the throes and uncertainties of massive desegregation become resolved, learning opportunities for all students will improve. The nation's schools now have before them the opportunity to implement inclusive learning laboratories recognizing individual and social contributions. The opportunity to provide multiple learning experiences, reflecting the inherent right of self-attainment and self-fulfillment within the democratic setting, is within our grasp.

Competition, Not Cooperation, Is the Name of the Game

Number Twelve

Practically, and especially politically, local interagency cooperation is a misnomer. More accurately it is local interagency competition. And the competition is really a gaming situation. Norton Long[1] cites the local community as an ecology of games—a territorial system in which a variety of games occur. The games provide such things as structures, goals, roles, strategies, tactics and publics to the players. Players in each game make use of those in other games—for example, the local superintendent uses the banker, the politician or the newsman and, in turn, is used by them in their games. Interaction among these games, Long suggests, produces unintended but systematically functional results for the ecology. Overarching top leadership and social games provide a vague set of commonly shared values which promote cooperation in the system.

However, the sheer "density of events," described by Karl Mannheim,[2] as in the case of multiple games being played, makes the possibility of a natural balance through competition or through mutual adaptation more and more hopeless. Reinforcing the problems spawned by competition, the Consensus-Dissensus Theory[3] points out that different strategies of cooperation are used depending upon the level of agreement between organizations as to objectives and the specific means by which they are to be attained. When discrepancies in objectives are great, the likelihood of any real interagency cooperation is remote.

But even competition is a form of cooperation. Unfortunately, though, in most competitive settings there have to be losers as well as winners. And, too, there are those even less fortunate—those who, for a host of reasons, often have not even been able to compete. Until most recently the argument has been that only the winners could assist the losers and others less fortunate. Pragmatically, this has meant that people with greater resources have shared them with others who have less. To accommodate this sharing an extensive network of eleemosynary agencies has emerged. Likewise, within governmental units the "principle" upon which legislation purportedly is formed and tax funds collected and distributed is one of collecting resources where they are most plentiful and committing them where they are most needed. The thrust of the principle, while it apparently has wide acceptance, does not, however, acknowledge man's desire to help himself—whatever may be his relative advantagement or disadvantagement. Nor does it resolve the many problems about which C. Northcote Parkinson, Lawrence J. Peter and Raymond Hull have written—problems which arise when people work together in groups and when each man considers what satisfies him.

An example of competition among local agencies is to be found in the 1970 United Foundation drive. Where Torch Drive yields were below set quotas, participating agencies have to be concerned with whether there will be an across-the-board cut in funding or whether there will be differential cuts. In Detroit, for instance, as a result of a two-year study, the United Foundation board of directors has approved changes in Torch Drive spending which allocate more support for blacks and low-income families, aid for unmarried parents, specialized outpatient medical care and efforts to improve race relations. The new emphases are upon

---

Samuel A. Moore, II, professor, Administration and Higher Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, prepared this article, "Local Interagency Cooperation," for *The School Administrator.* **It is the last in a series of 12 essays on the general subject, "Politics and Education."**

preventive services, involving recipients in program development and activities which have a discernable neighborhood base. Concurrently, these changes will probably reduce the U.F. funding of such agencies as Travelers Aid, YMCA, YWCA, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. There is no inference here that the agencies to receive proportionally less Torch Drive money are not worthy social welfare organizations, although some people do argue that these agencies predominately serve white suburbanites.

The reordering of priorities by the U.F. board in Detroit meets the principle of allocating resources where they might best serve today's social welfare needs. But how much persuasion is this going to have with the volunteer and staff workers in agencies being cut? Clearly, these people have vested interests, either emotional or financial, in the agencies with which they are associated. Moreover, the money to support the U.F. does not come heavily from the areas where it is to be spent. It is in the suburbs where the real test will occur. When one engages in discretionary giving of himself or his material resources, the nature and extent of his giving indicate what values he holds and, of course, the extent to which, in the case cited, he agrees with the new foci of the U.F.

Cooperation Is the Result of Participation

Yes, there is empirical evidence. Michael Aiken,[4] for one, has demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between participation and the extent to which there is diffusion of power within the community. But part of the argument is paranoid—out of a condition of restiveness and insecurity, some agencies are maintaining contacts with other agencies should it become necessary for agencies to merge. Lack of visible and persuasive relevancy to the current scene always portends the risk of dissolution, and relationships with adjunctive agencies provide a buffer against being wiped out. In the face of what may be artificial and superficial relationships among agencies, Martin Landau[5] suggests that overlapping service—redundancy—is necessary because it enables a greater reliability, especially in the provision of necessary social services.

While redundancy may be advisable, especially to ensure that necessary social services are accomplished, the very idea of redundancy involving multiple agencies argues that there may be extensive inefficiency. Given the urban setting, this may not be an immediate problem. Herman Turk[6] studied the flow of federal poverty monies to 130 of our largest cities, in many of which the headquarters of national associations are located. With some exceptions he found that the more national headquarters there were in a city, the higher was the level of interorganizational activity. But what really is interorganizational activity? Is it a collaborative effort to see that funds generated are best allocated to needed social service? Or is it a display of competitive concern with who gets what? For interagency cooperation the answer to both questions is yes. Both self-serving, or Parkinsonian, needs and humanistic social service needs will have to be met. And while these needs are distinctively different they also are inextricably tied together. The rationale is simple. Participants in interagency cooperation—both the doers and the recipients of the services—cannot be expected to exert any particular thrust if their personal needs are not being met.

Not only are personal needs diverse, they are often difficult to satisfy. And there is yet a further buffer to cooperative participation. As Samuel Tenenbaum[7] writes, "Since emphasis in the American culture is on individualism, on going it alone and doing it alone, no one ever feels that his good is merged in a cooperative tribal sense."

There are ways by which "role models" for cooperation can be devised with high visibility. An example of this would be what the late Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, said to President Nixon regarding the need for cooperative efforts to conquer social problems. Young's basic message was that there must be greater cooperation between government and nonprofit social service agencies. Further, he argued that the government will have to use its domestic appropriations more efficiently than it has in the past and that one strategy for this would be for the government to engage in more contracting with established private community groups and agencies to carry out vital programs. Not only would the government be a very visible role model of cooperative participation but, as Young stated, participation of black people presents an opportunity to use black pride, dignity and skills for tangible benefits—the very essence of responding effectively to man's desire to satisfy his personal needs.

Where in the Mosaic Do Schools Fit?

Ivan Illich[8] suggests that schools today perform three functions common to powerful churches throughout history: they are a repository of society's myth; they institutionalize that myth's contradictions and they form the locus of the ritual which reproduces and veils the disparities between myth and reality. A principal myth perpetuated by the school is that it, the school, is the crucial way-point in the rite of passage to adulthood.

The problem of where the school fits is filled with paradoxes. On the one hand, the school seems willing in an additive fashion to expand without limit the array of activities it sponsors; yet, on the other hand, the school has found it necessary to reduce the intrusion of some com-

50

munity groups wishing to use students as a captive audience. More specifically, local planning commissions know, as do educators, that the site of a school can predict demographic changes in a community. But it is also well known that if the school is competing with the highway department for a particular tract, the desires of the highway department often are given a higher priority. Likewise, the school may engage extensively in preventive medical activities, but it may not cross into the curative domain of the medical practitioner. Unquestionably schools are concerned with the development of sound character in youth, but overt use of sectarian materials is currently banned. If the school is to be a viable part of interagency cooperation the problems above are only adumbrative of choices which will have to be made between following the dictates of protective rationales or making a commitment to more social and humanistic considerations.

What does this mean for the schools? Paul Briggs, superintendent of schools, Cleveland, Ohio, confirmed the issue when he observed that the hot breakfast program in Cleveland had done as much to help young people as had their many experimental reading programs. But the school cannot go it alone. The question remains, How can the school, together with other community agencies, effectively intervene in improving the lot of youth and society? Also, there is an ever present fear of the development of an interlocking directorate of agencies concerned with social welfare. Milton Kotter,[9] for example, argues that city hall—the Man—deprives neighborhoods of their political significance. And, he adds, pushing the neighborhood as a "viable cultural unit" only tends to reinforce the strength of the downtown political hierarchy.

Interagency cooperation demands that the relationships developed not erode the distinctiveness of the several cooperating agencies. Special concern must be given to protecting "frail" groups or agencies which have close affiliations with sectors of the community but which may have a low visibility in the community-at-large.

Where a school fits in the mosaic of community life may depend upon whether the school sees itself only as a receiving agency—an agency which seeks to get support from without—or as both a receiving and giving agency—actively engaging in reciprocity with other community groups and agencies. Illustrating this basic difference in type are the superintendent who, when he attends a civic club meeting, talks only about school matters and the other superintendent who listens to *and hears* what other men at the meeting have to say about the particular activities in which they are interested.

Who Makes Out Doesn't Count—Or Does It?

When we talk about social service activities—especially those requiring a collaborative effort—zero sum games are out. Karl Jaspers[10] wrote, "Majorities . . . hate anyone basically different from themselves." Over time, public schools have enjoyed the majority position as a near single-franchise agency for providing formal education. Even our preparatory programs for educational administrators have, until most recently, urged the practitioner educator to assiduously avoid becoming tainted with political involvement in the community. The simple fact has been that when one was ensconced in the majority position for an activity he did not necessarily have to be responsive to the social milieu in the community about him.

Today it is different. The majority position does not have the insularity it once enjoyed. Interagency cooperation involving the school no longer is limited to the Junior Red Cross. Police liaison officers assigned in school buildings evidence a responsiveness of the school to growing restiveness and physical confrontation among youth. But, when school millage issues fail and the public at the same time supports improved police and fire protection, it must be asked whether the very separateness of these agencies is not a divisive force mitigating against a necessary closeness for cooperation. Who makes out counts very much—especially when agencies and groups must compete for resources.

Legislators make or break many social service agencies, including the schools. Scrutinized by their constituents, legislators tend to support legislation which is for the greater good of man. But is there equivalent evidence that, once passed, these enactments are sufficiently funded to impact upon public welfare? Often there is no appropriation. Neither establishing a commission nor developing guidelines for activities serves effective purpose if resources are not committed to enable a sufficient effort—an effort which holds the promise of success.

Nor is prudential funding enough. Resources allocated to agencies tend, historically, to be spent in essentially the same ways they have been in the past. If anything, the current press for accountability will heighten even more a reliance upon past practice—the practice of maintaining a relatively independent operation and using well-established reporting procedures.

If interagency cooperation is to be effected the several agencies and groups to be involved must be internally strong enough to give away some of their domain without a concomitant feeling of loss. A reliance upon demonstrable incremental gains must be abandoned. The frequency of interorganizational contacts, the number of people involved, the employment of coordinative personnel—none of these "measures" speaks to the quality of cooperative ventures. None of these indices speaks at all to whether there is an accrual of value for the recipients of social serv-

51

ices—youth and society.

Probably the most recent (and now dated) effort at a broadly based cooperative venture was the development of a community calendar. Not out of altruism, but out of a concern that potential audiences might be splintered, the calendar serves to assure that each group has its shot at the full population potential.

Today, communities are too complex—too many activities occur at the same time. The youth who was not able to make it on an interscholastic team finds that his choice of a substitute activity conflicts with a practice session for the community recreation league. And he cannot get to either activity anyway; his mother does not get the car until her husband comes home from work and she wants the whole family to go to the county health department mobile X-ray van to check for respiratory diseases.

Interagency cooperation means transcending merely having a community calendar. The open sharing of resources—both material and personal—and intimate involvement of a broad array of interested people in multiple community agencies are essential. It means too that many people in each agency must be engaged in interagency ventures. The contagion of cooperation is not served best by designating some*one* as the agency liaison person. Roland Warren's sensitive inquiry into the interorganizational field evidences this when he says, "There is some indication that excellence in a city's urban renewal program, or public school system, or transit system is often brought about largely through the passionate commitment of relatively single-minded individuals and/or organizations."[11]

Anatole France—in the idiom of present-day speech—got it all together when he said, "I would prefer the errors of enthusiasm to the indifference of wisdom."

FOOTNOTES

1. Long, Norton E. "The Local Community as an Ecology of Games." *The American Journal of Sociology* 64:3 (November 1958), 251-61.

2. Mannheim, Karl. *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction: Studies in Modern Social Structure*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1951. p. 157.

3. Warren, Roland L., and Hyman, Herbert H. "Purposive Community Change in Consensus and Dissensus Situations." *Community Mental Health Journal* 2:4 (Winter 1966), 293-300.

4. Aiken, Michael. "Community Power and Community Mobilization." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 385 (September 1969), 76-89.

5. Landau, Martin. "Redundancy, Rationality and the Problem of Duplication and Overlap." *Public Administration Review* 29:4 (July-August 1969), 346-358.

6. Turk, Herman. "Interorganizational Networks in Urban Society: Inital Perspectives and Comparative Research." *American Sociological Review* 35:1 (February 1970), 1-19.

7. Tenenbaum, Samuel. "The Insufferable Lot of the American Middle Class Child." *Educational Leadership* 27:3 (December, 1969), 277-80.

8. Illich, Ivan. "Schooling: The Ritual of Progress." *The New York Review of Books* 15:10 (December 3, 1970), 21.

9. Kotter, Milton. *Neighborhood Governments: The Local Foundations of Political Life*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

10. Jaspers, Karl. *The Idea of the University*. (Ed. by Karl W. Deutsch and trans. by H.A.T. Reiche and H. F. Vanderschmidt.) Boston: Beacon Press, 1959. p. 129.

11. Warren, Roland L. "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Investigation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12:3 (December 1967), 419.

52